arXiv:math/9907107v2 [math.DG] 20 Jul 1999

PU(2) MONOPOLES. III: EXISTENCE OF GLUING AND OBSTRUCTION MAPS

PAUL M. N. FEEHAN AND THOMAS G. LENESS

Abstract. This is the third installment in our series of articles on the application of the PU(2) monopole equations to prove Witten's conjecture concerning the relation between the Donaldson and Seiberg-Witten invariants of smooth four-manifolds. The moduli space of solutions to the PU(2) monopole equations provides a noncompact cobordism between links of compact moduli spaces of U(1) monopoles of Seiberg-Witten type and the moduli space of anti-self-dual SO(3) connections, which appear as singularities in this larger moduli space. In this paper we prove the first part of a general gluing theorem for PU(2) monopoles. The ultimate purpose of the gluing theorem is to provide topological models for neighborhoods of ideal Seiberg-Witten moduli spaces appearing in lower levels of the Uhlenbeck compactification of the moduli space of PU(2) monopoles and thus permit calculations of their contributions to Donaldson invariants using the PU(2)-monopole cobordism.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries 10
3. Splicing extended PU(2) monopoles 15
4. Regularity of solutions to extended PU(2) monopole equations 21
5. Estimates for approximate PU(2) monopoles 30
6. Global, uniform elliptic estimates for the anti-self-dual and Dirac operators 36
7. The Dirichlet problem for the Dirac Laplacian 39
8. Eigenvalue estimates for PU(2)-monopole Laplacians 51
9. Existence of solutions to the extended PU(2)-monopole equations 78
References 89

1. Introduction

The Pidstrigatch-Tyurin program [53], [54] to relate the Donaldson and Seiberg-Witten invariants, as considered in [17], [29], [28], [24] requires a gluing theory, for PU(2) monopoles, possessing the properties we establish here and in the sequel [26]. The purpose of gluing,

---

Date: This version: July 20, 1999. First version: July 15, 1999. math.DG/9907107.

The first author was supported in part by an NSF Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Fellowship under grant DMS 9306061 and by NSF grants DMS 9704174 and, through the Institute for Advanced Study, by DMS 9729992.

as we outlined in [28], is to provide topological models for neighborhoods of ideal Seiberg-Witten moduli spaces appearing in lower levels of the Uhlenbeck compactification of the moduli space of PU(2) monopoles and thus enable calculations of their contributions to Donaldson invariants using the PU(2)-monopole cobordism [27].

1.1. **Statement of results.** The main purpose of the present article and its companion [26] is to prove a general gluing theorem for PU(2) monopoles, adequate for the topological calculations mentioned in [28] and carried out in detail in [21], [27].

Throughout our work we let (X, g) be a closed, connected, oriented, C^∞ Riemannian four-manifold with $b^+(X) > 0$ and spin^c structure $\mathfrak{s}_0 = (\rho, W^+, W^-)$. We require that the perturbation parameters defining the PU(2) monopole equations (2.1) be generic, so the transversality results of [12], [17], and [33] ensure that the moduli spaces of PU(2) monopoles, Seiberg-Witten U(1) monopoles, and anti-self-dual SO(3) connections possess the usual smoothness properties and have the expected dimension.

While we shall direct the reader to §2, §3, and §9 for detailed definitions and notation, we note that $M^{\mathrm{sw}}(\mathfrak{s}_0)$ is the moduli space of Seiberg-Witten monopoles on X, that $M(\mathfrak{t})$ is the moduli space of PU(2) monopoles on X for a spin^u structure $\mathfrak{t} = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E)$, where E is a Hermitian, rank-two bundle over X, and that $M(\mathfrak{t}, \mu)$ is a finite-dimensional thickened or virtual moduli space of PU(2) monopoles which contains $M(\mathfrak{t})$, as a submanifold away from singularities, with $\mu > 0$ a small-eigenvalue bound arising in the extended PU(2) monopole equations which define $M(\mathfrak{t}, \mu)$. We let $w \in H^2(X; \mathbb{Z})$ be a class such that no SO(3) bundle over X with second Stiefel-Whitney class equal to w (mod 2) admits a flat connection. The open subset $M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}) \subset M(\mathfrak{t})$ is represented by pairs such that the SO(3) connection is not reducible and the spinor is not identically zero.

Theorem 1.1. *Let E be a rank-two, Hermitian vector bundle over X with $c_1(E) = w$ and $c_2(E) - \frac{1}{4}c_1(E)^2 = \kappa \geq 1$. Let $0 < \ell < \lfloor \kappa \rfloor \leq \kappa$ be an integer, let E_ℓ be the rank-two, Hermitian vector bundle over X with $\det E_\ell = \det E$ and $c_2(E_\ell) = c_2(E) - \ell$. Let $\mathfrak{t} = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E)$ and $\mathfrak{t}_\ell = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E_\ell)$. Let $\Sigma \subset \mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$ be a smooth stratum and let $\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu} \Subset M(\mathfrak{t}_\ell, \mu)$ be a finite-dimensional, precompact, open, S^1-invariant subset. The space $\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}$ is a tubular neighborhood of $\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu} \cap M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)$, of size $\varepsilon_\ell > 0$ via the tubular distance function (9.39). Then, for a small enough positive constants ε_ℓ and λ_0, there are*

- *A compact Lie group $\mathbf{G}(\Sigma)$, an S^1-equivariant C^∞ principle $\mathbf{G}(\Sigma)$-bundle $\mathbf{Fr}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma) \to \mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu} \times \Sigma$, a universal topological $\mathbf{G}(\Sigma)$-space $\mathbf{Z}(\Sigma)$, and an S^1-equivariant fiber bundle*

$$\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0) = \mathbf{Fr}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma) \times_{\mathbf{G}(\Sigma)} \mathbf{Z}(\Sigma) \to \mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu} \times \Sigma.$$

  Here, λ_0 is a sufficiently small positive constant, depending at most on $(g, \kappa, \mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu})$.
- *An S^1-equivariant C^∞ map $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma} : \mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0) \to M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}, \mu)$, where $\mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0) \subset \mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0)$ is the open subset (3.26).*
- *An S^1-equivariant C^∞ section $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mu,\Sigma}$ of an S^1-equivariant C^∞ vector bundle Ξ_μ over $\mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0)$. The bundle Ξ_μ has real rank equal to 2ℓ plus the real codimension of $M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}) \subset M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}, \mu)$.*

Together, the map $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma}$ and section $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mu,\Sigma}$ have the property that

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma}(\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mu,\Sigma}^{-1}(0)) \subset M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}).$$

We call $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu},\Sigma,\lambda_0)$ the *bundle of local gluing data*, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma}$ the *local gluing map*, Ξ_μ the *local obstruction bundle*, and $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mu,\Sigma}$ the *local obstruction section*. The gluing maps and obstruction sections are defined in §3 and §9. Theorem 1.1, along with many other results, was announced in [14]. An earlier version of this result, leaning more toward the gluing method of Donaldson [10], [13], [12] — which is less satisfactory for our application (see the explanations below) — was announced in [15] and the corresponding preprint [22] (containing a detailed proof) was written during 1995 and distributed to a small audience during Spring 1996. The solution to the gluing problem described here and in [26] follows more in the tradition of Taubes' approach [58], [60], [62] to the problem of gluing anti-self-dual connections. Though better suited to our application [27], it has long appeared that Taubes' method was much more difficult to adapt to the case of PU(2) monopoles than that of Donaldson, due primarily to the technical Problem 1.4 discussed in §1.3 below and, indeed, its solution eluded us for some time despite considerable effort.

Naturally, many statements of gluing theorems for anti-self-dual connections have appeared before in the literature [10], [12], [13], [51], [58], [60], [61], [62], so the reader may reasonably ask what is new and different about PU(2) monopoles. The gluing-theorem statements that are closest to those needed for a proof of the Witten conjecture are given by PU(2)-monopole analogues of the gluing Theorems 3.4.10 and 3.4.17 (for anti-self-dual connections) in [34]: both assertions are based on work of Taubes, principally [58], [60], [61], [62]. In any event, the difficulties which are peculiar to gluing PU(2) monopoles are discussed in §1.3. Furthermore, there are several important properties which are required of a useful gluing theory — in any context, but particularly for applications to Witten's conjecture — which are *not* asserted by Theorem 1.1. These extensions are discussed in §1.5 and are derived in the companion article [26].

1.2. PU(2) monopoles and Witten's conjecture.

Recall that a closed, smooth four-manifold X has Kronheimer-Mrowka simple type provided the Donaldson invariants corresponding to products z of homology classes in $H_\bullet(X;\mathbb{Z})$ and a generator $x\in H_0(X;\mathbb{Z})$ are related by $D^w_X(x^2z)=4D^w_X(z)$. Kronheimer and Mrowka [44] showed that the Donaldson series of a four-manifold of Kronheimer-Mrowka simple type with $b^1(X)=0$ and odd $b^+(X)\geq 3$ is given by

$$\mathbf{D}^w_X = e^{Q_X/2}\sum_{r=1}^{s}(-1)^{(w^2+w\cdot K_r)/2}a_r e^{K_r}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $w\in H_2(X;\mathbb{Z})$, Q_X is the intersection form on $H_2(X;\mathbb{Z})$, the coefficients a_r are non-zero rational numbers, and the $K_r\in H^2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ are the Kronheimer-Mrowka basic classes. They also conjectured the shape of the general structure theorem for four-manifolds of possibly non-simple type [43].

Conjecture 1.2 (Witten)**.** [71] The four-manifold X has Kronheimer-Mrowka simple type if and only if it has Seiberg-Witten simple type. If X has simple type, then the Kronheimer-Mrowka basic classes coincide with the Seiberg-Witten basic classes and

$$\mathbf{D}^w_X = 2^{2-c(X)}e^{Q_X/2}\sum_{\mathfrak{s}\in\mathrm{Spin}^c(X)}(-1)^{(w^2+w\cdot c_1(\mathfrak{s}))/2}SW_X(\mathfrak{s})e^{c_1(\mathfrak{s})}. \tag{1.2}$$

The quantum field theory argument giving the relation (1.2) when $b^+(X) \geq 3$ has been extended by Moore and Witten [46] to allow $b^+(X) \geq 1$, $b^1(X) \geq 0$, and four-manifolds X of possibly non-simple type.

The idea of Pidstrigach and Tyurin [54] for proving Witten's conjecture [46], [71] has two principal steps. The first step is to try to show that the Donaldson invariants are given by a sum over the Seiberg-Witten basic classes of terms given by universal polynomials in the intersection form Q_X and the classes $c_1(\mathfrak{s})$ and Λ, with coefficients depending only on products of the classes $c_1(\mathfrak{s})$, Λ, and w, the Donaldson-invariant degree δ, the Seiberg-Witten invariant $SW_X(\mathfrak{s})$, and the signature $\sigma(X)$ and Euler characteristic $\chi(X)$ (see Conjectures 4.1 and 4.2 in [28]). While this "homotopy version" of Witten's conjecture would not immediately yield the formula (1.2), it does imply that the Donaldson invariants are completely determined by and computable (in principle) from the Seiberg-Witten invariants.

The existence of a universal formula is expected because the moduli space of PU(2) monopoles contains both the Donaldson moduli space of anti-self-dual connections and moduli spaces of U(1) monopoles of Seiberg-Witten type and so provides a cobordism between suitably defined, codimension-one links of these moduli spaces. The second step is to try to determine these universal formulas explicitly via known examples and recursion relations, including those obtained from blow-up formulas for Donaldson and Seiberg-Witten invariants [30], [31]. The work of Göttsche [37] suggests that the second part of this strategy should ultimately succeed as, for example, he was able to compute the wall-crossing formula for the Donaldson invariants of simply-connected four-manifolds with $b^+(X) = 1$ and $b^1(X) = 0$, under the assumption that the Kotschick-Morgan conjecture [42] holds for such four-manifolds; that conjecture asserts that for four-manifolds with $b^+(X) = 1$, the Donaldson invariants computed using metrics lying in two different chambers of the positive cone in $H^2(X;\mathbb{R})$ differ by a universal polynomial whose coefficients depend only on homotopy data [42].

1.3. **Some technical difficulties associated with gluing PU(2) monopoles.** Aside from certain aspects of gluing theory for instantons which were not completely addressed prior to the Seiberg-Witten revolution, there are a number of features of the PU(2) monopole equations which makes the gluing theory especially challenging. Since it will take a sequel [26] to complete the proofs of the additional properties required (the embedding property, surjectivity, and Uhlenbeck continuity) for our application [27], it seems worthwhile to motivate the lengthy development by commenting on a few of the technical difficulties at the outset.

The splicing (or "pre-gluing" or "cut-and-paste") construction yields families of approximate PU(2) monopoles, (A, Φ),

$$\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi) \approx 0,$$

where the map $\mathfrak{S}(\cdot, \cdot)$ defines the PU(2) monopole equations (2.1), A is a connection on the SO(3) bundle $\mathfrak{g}_E$, and Φ a section of $V^+ = W^+ \otimes E$. Given an approximate PU(2) monopole (A, Φ), we would like to solve for a deformation (a, ϕ) such that

$$\mathfrak{S}(A + a, \Phi + \phi) = 0. \tag{1.3}$$

The preceding equation can be rewritten as

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}(a, \phi) + \{(a, \phi), (a, \phi)\} = -\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi), \tag{1.4}$$

where $d^1_{A,\Phi} = (D\mathfrak{S})_{A,\Phi}$. We now seek a solution $(a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) \in (\operatorname{Ker} d^1_{A,\Phi})^\perp$, so

$$d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) + \{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\} = -\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi). \tag{1.5}$$

This brings us to a familiar difficulty in gauge theory when attempting to solve non-linear partial differential equations by splicing solutions:

Problem 1.3. The Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ is *not* uniformly invertible. It has *small eigenvalues*, tending to *zero* as (A,Φ) bubbles and $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$ converges to zero.

Small eigenvalues occur here because the adjoint Dirac operators $D^*_{A_i}$ over S^4 have non-trivial kernels, as does the adjoint linearization $d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ over X, where (A_0,Φ_0) is a background pair over X and A_i is an instanton over S^4. Instead, motivated by [60], we should try to solve an *extended* PU(2) *monopole equation*,

$$\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A+a,\Phi+\phi) = 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) + \Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\} = -\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi), \tag{1.6}$$

for deformations $(a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)$ such that $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(v,\psi) = 0$, where $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ is the L^2-orthogonal projection onto the eigenspaces of $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ with eigenvalues less than $\mu > 0$. To solve equation (9.11) we need a uniform estimate for a right inverse $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ of the operator $d^1_{A,\Phi} \circ \Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}$. For this purpose we try to adapt Taubes' method in [58], which relies on a clever use of the Bochner formula for $d^+_A d^{+,*}_A$ and choice of Banach spaces (namely $L^\sharp(X)$, as defined in §5) to achieve the desired estimate in the case of the anti-self-dual equation. It is at this point that we encounter one of the more persistent problems peculiar to PU(2)-monopole gluing:

Problem 1.4. The Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ has the shape

$$d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi} = \begin{pmatrix} d^+_A d^{+,*}_A & 0 \\ 0 & D_A D^*_A \end{pmatrix} + \text{non-diagonal lower-order terms}$$

have the shape

$$\begin{aligned} 2 d^+_A d^{+,*}_A &= \nabla^*_A \nabla_A + \{F^+_A, \cdot\} + \text{bounded zeroth-order terms}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E), \\ D_A D^*_A &= \nabla^*_A \nabla_A + \rho(F^-_A) + \text{bounded zeroth-order terms}, \quad \text{on } \Gamma(V^-), \end{aligned}$$

where F^+_A is $L^{\sharp,2}$ *small*, but F^-_A is $L^{\sharp,2}$ *large* (as, roughly speaking, it is the component of F_A which "bubbles"), with the remaining zeroth-order terms given by curvatures of connections which remain fixed throughout. *A priori* estimates [29] give a uniform L^∞ bound on F^+_A but at best an L^2 bound on F^-_A, for PU(2) monopoles (A,Φ).

The practical effect of the last problem is that it becomes exceedingly difficult to obtain an estimate for $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$, that is a bound of the form

$$\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \le C \|d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)}, \tag{1.7}$$

with constant C which is uniform with respect to the bubbling pair (A,Φ). Naively, everywhere one sees a lower-order term F^+_A in Taubes' arguments in [62, §5], one should replace this by a term F_A, in view of the Bochner formula for $(2d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}, D_A D_A^*)$. In so doing, one quickly realizes that Taubes' argument breaks down (bear in mind that Taubes is solving the self-dual rather than the anti-self-dual equation and that we have switched conventions to the now customary anti-self-dual equation). For example, in passing from equation (5.17) to (5.18) in [62] Taubes uses the fact that F_A^+ is $L^{\sharp,2}$-small to permit rearrangement: the condition on F_A^+ is embodied in the first equation of [62, p. 193] and the hypothesis of his Lemma 5.6. In addition to the preceding difficulty, one needs to derive suitable small-eigenvalue bounds in order to address Problem 1.3 using the above fairly weak Bochner formulas. Thus, to say the least, it is a challenging task to reproduce analogues of Taubes' results in the case of PU(2) monopoles. Consequently, one of the main results of this paper is to show that in fact this can be done, despite these obstacles, and derive the key estimate (1.7) (see Corollary 9.3). One of the major obstacles is the problem of bounding negative spinors uniformly in $L^q_{1,A}$, $q > 2$, with respect to F_A and the radii of small balls surrounding curvature bubbles when all one has is the weak Bochner formula for $D_A D_A^*$ given above (this problem is addressed in §6 and §7, using decay estimates for eigenspinors in [18]).

Instead of trying to adapt Taubes' method for constructing a right-inverse, one could alternatively try to adapt the Donaldson-Kronheimer method for writing the extended anti-self-dual equations and constructing a right inverse with the appropriate bound [12, §7.2]. Indeed, this is the approach we initially took in [22]: one has to modify their method, as the PU(2) monopole equations are not conformally invariant [29, §4.2]. The principal difference is that, instead of constructing an "intrinsic" right inverse $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ based on spectral bounds, one can modify the traditional method of constructing a parametrix for a pseudodifferential operator [36], [39] and patch together right inverses corresponding to the background pairs (A_0, Φ_0) away from a a collection of small balls and the instantons $(A_i, 0)$ spliced in from S^4 onto small balls in X, keeping the metric g on TX fixed rather than allowing it to vary conformally as in [12]. In this situation, the main technical problem addressed in [22] was the need to allow the instantons A_i to vary over their entire moduli spaces rather than precompact subsets (as in [12]). A third possibility, not considered here, might be to use the long-cylinder model for gluing as in [48] for the Seiberg-Witten equations, following the example of [51]. However, in this situation, the metric is varying (with multiple tube lengths) and appears less appropriate for our purpose, for reasons discussed in the paragraph below.

With either of these two gluing methods, one needs to fit together the resulting topological models as the stratum Σ varies through the symmetric product $\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$ so as to form a global model (as in [27]) and it turns out that the method of [12, §7.2] appears not well suited to this task. It is for this reason that we ultimately chose the technically more demanding path initiated in this paper and concluded in [26]. As we shall explain in [27], Taubes' method does adapt well to the requirement that one can fit together the local gluing-data bundles $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0)$ in such a way as to construct a global gluing-data space $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell, \lambda_0)$.

We note in passing that if $(A, \Phi) + d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v, \psi)$ solves the extended PU(2) monopole equation, then it is a true PU(2) monopole if and only if (v, ψ) also solves the obstruction equation

$$\boldsymbol{\chi}_\mu(A, \Phi) \equiv \Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\Big(\{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v, \psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v, \psi)\} + \mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\Big) = 0.$$

However, for our topological calculations, it is enough to only solve the extended equation. The map $(A,\Phi)\mapsto\boldsymbol{\chi}_\mu(A,\Phi)$ defines a section of a local obstruction bundle $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_\mu$ over $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu},\Sigma,\mu)$, while the assignment $(A,\Phi)\mapsto\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma}(A,\Phi)=(A,\Phi)+d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)$ defines the local gluing map.

There is one remaining difficulty which is most convenient to address in [27], when actually carrying out the requisite topological calculations:

Problem 1.5. If $\dim M^{\mathrm{sw}}_{\mathfrak{s}}>0$, one cannot necessarily fix a single, uniform positive upper bound μ for the small eigenvalues of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$, due to spectral flow as the point $[A,\Phi]$ varies in a space $\mathcal{U}_\ell\subset\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)$ containing $M^{\mathrm{sw}}_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

If it were not for spectral flow, one could define thickened moduli spaces of PU(2) monopoles using the *intrinsic, extended* PU(2) *monopole equations*, $\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)=0$, the equations being "intrinsic" because they are defined on the configuration space $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ of all pairs rather than only on the space of gluing data, as in the case of Taubes' version of the extended equations. In [23] we constructed a thickened moduli space of PU(2) monopoles by adapting the Atiyah-Singer stabilization method, but — unlike Taubes' method — this technique does not mesh particularly well with the non-compactness due to bubbling and with gluing. We remark that it would be preferable, for the purposes of fitting together the spaces of local gluing data indexed by the strata $\Sigma\subset\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$, to exclusively use the intrinsic extended equations rather than the extended equations. However, while perhaps not impossible, the gluing theory for the intrinsic, extended PU(2) monopole equations appears considerably more difficult; the problems are explained in a little more detail in §9.

1.4. Outline.

We now summarize the contents of the remainder of this article.

We recall the definition of the PU(2) monopole equations and the basic transversality and compactness properties of the PU(2) monopole moduli space in §2.

In §3 we define the *local splicing* or *pre-gluing map* $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu,\Sigma}$ for monopoles by adapting the cut-and-paste techniques of [58], [60], [61], and [62]. The important technical issue here is to keep track of the constants defining the splicing map itself. The splicing maps yield continuous maps (smooth away from singularities) from bundles of gluing data, one bundle per smooth stratum $\Sigma\subset\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$, into the configuration space $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ of pairs $[A,\Phi]$, whose image is Uhlenbeck-close to the space $M(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)\times\Sigma$. The question of exactly how "close" is addressed in and §5. Later, in [27], we return to the issue of how the bundles of local gluing data, $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\mu,\ell},\Sigma,\lambda_0)\to\mathcal{U}_{\mu,\ell}\times\Sigma$, and local splicing maps, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu,\Sigma}$, may be assembled into a space of *global gluing data* with projection map, $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\mu,\ell},\lambda_0)\to\mathcal{U}_{\mu,\ell}\times\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$, and *global splicing map*, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_\mu$.

In §4 we recall the regularity theory for the PU(2) monopole equations [29, §3] which, indeed, applies to any quasi-linear first-order elliptic equation with a quadratic non-linearity on a four-manifold. The results are used repeatedly throughout the present article and its sequels, so precise statements are given. The general pattern is that one typically has uniform, global L^2_1 estimates for solutions to the PU(2) monopole equations (obtained, for example, by deforming an approximate, spliced solution), but when we need estimates with respect to stronger norms — uniform with respect to a non-compact parameter — we must get by with only local estimates. The regularity section concludes with a proof that an L^2_1

gluing solution (a,ϕ) to the extended PU(2) monopole equations is in L^2_k (with $k \geq 4$) if the spliced pair (A,Φ) is in L^2_k (Proposition 4.16).

Section 5 gives an estimate for $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$, when (A,Φ) is an approximate solution to the PU(2) monopole equations (2.1) produced by splicing. A point that first arises here — but will recur in sections 6, 7, 8, and 9 and which needs to be continually borne in mind — is that we shall almost always want estimates for pairs where the constants depend at most on the global $L^{\sharp,2}$ norms of the curvatures of the potentially bubbling SO(3) connections or their L^∞ norms when restricted to suitable open sets. There are different ways these estimates can be achieved, depending on the geometry of the region in X where estimates are required. The cleanest approach is to use decay estimates for Yang-Mills connections (which we apply to the instantons we splice in from S^4), due in varying degrees of generality to Donaldson, Groisser-Parker, Morgan-Mrowka-Ruberman, or Råde; in sections 7, 8, and 9 we also use the decay estimates for eigenspinors derived in [18].

Section 6 collects the basic, global, uniform elliptic estimates for the anti-self-dual and Dirac operators which are used to estimate small eigenvalues of the Laplacian in §8 and to estimate the partial right inverse $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ in §9.

At an important crux step (see inequalities (9.24) and (9.29)) in our derivation of a uniform bound for the partial right inverse $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ in §9 we shall need a uniform $L^q_{1,A}(U)$ estimate for a negative spinor ψ in terms of the $\|D_AD_A^*\psi\|_{L^p(X)}$ when $1 < p \leq 2$ and $4/3 < q \leq 4$ are defined by $1/p = 1/q + 1/4$, with q at least slightly greater than 2 and $U \subset X$ the complement of small balls B_i in X where we splice in instantons from S^4 (and the spinor Φ is zero). This crucial estimate is provided by Theorem 7.1 and the purpose of §7 is to prove this result, one of the more delicate ones in this paper. It is important to recognize at the outset that such an estimate (with the needed uniformity property) does *not* follow from a naive application of a global elliptic estimate over all of X to a cutoff spinor $\chi\psi$, where $d\chi$ is supported on small annuli surrounding the balls B_i and χ is zero on the balls B_i (where the curvature of A is large).

Our technique hinges on the fact that [18] provides us with good decay estimates for eigenspinors away from the region of X where the curvature of A is large, namely the balls B_i. In §6 we use these decay estimates to obtain a uniform $L^2_{1,A}(U)$ elliptic bound for ψ by splitting ψ into a "small-eigenvalue" component and its L^2-orthogonal complement, as the latter component can be estimated separately (over all of X) using results of [16]. Unfortunately, the method of §6 does not give $L^q_{1,A}(U)$ estimates when $q > 2$. Instead, in order to obtain an $L^q_{1,A}(U)$ estimate for $\psi|_U$ which is uniform with respect to the radii of the balls B_i, we would like to apply the Calderon-Zygmund theorem to $\psi|_U$. The latter application would require that $\psi = 0$ on the boundary ∂U and, as we cannot assume this, we instead apply the Calderon-Zygmund theorem to $(\psi - h)|_U$, where h obeys $D_AD_A^*h = 0$ and $h = \psi$ on ∂U. The requisite $L^2_{1,A}(U)$ estimate for ψ is provided by Proposition 6.7 (see inequality (6.13)).

Splicing produces a family, (A,Φ), of approximate PU(2) monopoles on X and thus a family of Laplacians, $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$. We shall need upper and lower bounds for the small eigenvalues of this Laplacian, along with estimates for its eigensections. These and related estimates are derived in §8.

Section 9 assembles the proof of the existence of a partial right inverse to the linearization, with useful bounds, and then deduces the existence of solutions to the *extended* PU(2) *monopole equations*. Viewed globally, this step yields the local gluing and obstruction maps and allows us to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1.

1.5. **Sequels and related articles.** Some remarks are in order concerning the contents of the companion articles [26] and [27].

1.5.1. *Properties of gluing maps.* The reader will note that the main result proved here is at most the first half of a desired "gluing theorem". To be of use for parameterizing neighborhoods of ideal, reducible PU(2) monopoles, we also need the following properties:

1. *Continuity.* The local gluing map $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma}$ extends to a continuous map on the Uhlenbeck closure of the gluing data, $\bar{\mathbf{Gl}}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu},\Sigma,\lambda_0)$.
2. *Embedding property.* The map $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma}$ is a smooth embedding of $\mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu},\Sigma,\lambda_0)$ and a topological embedding of the Uhlenbeck closure of the gluing data, $\bar{\mathbf{Gl}}(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu},\Sigma,\lambda_0)$.
3. *Surjectivity.* The image of $\bar{\mathbf{Gl}}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu},\Sigma,\lambda_0)\cap\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mu,\Sigma}^{-1}(0)$ under $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma}$ is an open subset of $\bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$ and the space $\bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$ has a finite covering by such open subsets.

These remaining properties (1), (2), (3) are proved in [26] and comprise the second half of the gluing theorem. It is important to note that preceding three gluing-map properties are not simple consequences of the proof of existence of solutions to the (extended) PU(2) monopole equations and their justification constitutes the more difficult half of the proof of the full gluing theorem. In particular, despite an extensive literature on gluing theory for anti-self-dual connections, the existing accounts (see, for example, [10], [12], [51], [58], [60], [61], [62]) even there only address somewhat special cases which do not capture all of the difficulties one encounters when attempting to solve the complete gluing problem for anti-self-dual connections.

1.5.2. *Intersection theory and completion of the proof of the homotopy Witten conjecture.* In work in preparation, [27], we complete the proof of the "homotopy version" of the Witten conjecture. This is carried out by first altering the domains of the gluing maps in a manner allowing a description of their overlaps which depends only on the homotopy type of X, but does not change the gluing (deformation) theory of the present article and its companion [26]. A topological description of the obstruction bundle is then given which, together with a technique for describing cohomology classes with compact support, allows us to evaluate the integrals over the links in terms of Seiberg-Witten invariants and homotopy data for the manifold X.

1.6. **Acknowledgments.** The first author is grateful to Tom Mrowka and Jeff McNeal for helpful discussions. He warmly acknowledges the hospitality and support of the many institutions where various parts of the present article and its companions were written, including Harvard University, Ohio State University (Columbus), the Max Planck Institut für Mathematik (Bonn), together with the Institute des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques (Bures-sur-Yvette) and the Institute for Advanced Study (Princeton), where the article was finally completed. He would also like to thank the National Science Foundation for their support during the preparation of this article. The second author also expresses his gratitude for the hospitality of Harvard University, Ohio State University, and the Institute for Advanced Studies during his visits and for the support of Florida International University.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we recall the framework for gauge theory for PU(2) monopoles established in [17], [29]. In §2.1 we describe the PU(2) monopole equations while in §2.2 we recall our Uhlenbeck compactness and transversality results from [17], [29].

2.1. **PU(2) monopoles.**

Throughout this article, X denotes a closed, connected, oriented, smooth four-manifold. We shall briefly recall the description of the moduli space of PU(2) monopoles from [17], [29], [28]. We give X a Riemannian metric g and consider Hermitian two-plane bundles E over X whose determinant line bundles $\det E$ are isomorphic to a fixed Hermitian line bundle endowed with a fixed C^∞, unitary connection A_e. Let $\mathfrak{s}_0 = (\rho, W^+, W^-)$ be a spin^c structure on X, where $\rho : T^*X \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(W^+, W^-)$ is a Clifford map compatible with g and so obeys the properties of (2.4), and the Hermitian four-plane bundle $W = W^+ \oplus W^-$ is endowed with a C^∞, unitary connection. Clifford multiplication extends to an injective, linear map $\rho : \Lambda^\bullet(T^*X) \to \operatorname{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(W)$ in the usual way. The unitary connection on W uniquely determines a Riemannian connection on T^*X, by requiring that it act as a derivation with respect to the Clifford map ρ, and determines a unitary connection on $\det W^+$; conversely, a choice of Riemannian connection on T^*X and unitary connection on $\det W^+$ induce a unitary connection on W. We shall require the connection on W to be spin^c , that is, it induces the Levi-Civita connection on T^*X for the given Riemannian metric. In order to take advantage of decay estimates for Yang-Mills connections [12], [38], [55], we can assume without loss that the fixed connections A_d and A_e are Yang-Mills when convenient.

Let $k \geq 4$ be an integer and let $\mathcal{A}_E$ be the space of L^2_k connections A on the U(2) bundle E all inducing the fixed determinant connection A_e on $\det E$. Equivalently, following [44, §2(i)], we may view $\mathcal{A}_E$ as the space of L^2_k connections A on the PU(2) = SO(3) bundle $\mathfrak{su}(E)$. We shall pass back and forth between these viewpoints, via the fixed connection on $\det E$, relying on the context to make the distinction clear. Given a unitary connection A on E with curvature $F_A \in L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^2 \otimes \mathfrak{u}(E))$, then $(F_A^+)_0 \in L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{su}(E))$ denotes the traceless part of its self-dual component. Equivalently, if A is a connection on $\mathfrak{su}(E)$ with curvature $F_A \in L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^2 \otimes \mathfrak{so}(\mathfrak{su}(E)))$, then $\operatorname{ad}^{-1}(F_A^+) \in L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{su}(E))$ is its self-dual component, viewed as a section of $\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{su}(E)$ via the isomorphism $\operatorname{ad} : \mathfrak{su}(E) \to \mathfrak{so}(\mathfrak{su}(E))$. When no confusion can arise, the isomorphism $\operatorname{ad} : \mathfrak{su}(E) \to \mathfrak{so}(\mathfrak{su}(E))$ will be implicit and so we regard F_A as a section of $\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{su}(E)$ when A is a connection on $\mathfrak{su}(E)$. The *instanton number* for E is defined by $\kappa = -\frac{1}{4}p_1(\mathfrak{su}(E)) = c_2(E) - \frac{1}{4}c_1(E)^2$.

It will be convenient to define Hermitian vector bundles $V = W \otimes E$ and $V = V^+ \oplus V^-$, where $V^\pm = W^\pm \otimes E$. For an L^2_k section Φ of $W^+ \otimes E$, let $\Phi^* = \langle \cdot, \Phi \rangle$ be its pointwise Hermitian dual and let $(\Phi \otimes \Phi^*)_{00}$ be the component of the Hermitian endomorphism $\Phi \otimes \Phi^*$ of $W^+ \otimes E$ which lies in $\mathfrak{su}(W^+) \otimes \mathfrak{su}(E)$. The Clifford multiplication ρ defines an isomorphism $\rho : \Lambda^+ \to \mathfrak{su}(W^+)$ and thus an isomorphism $\rho = \rho \otimes \operatorname{id}_{\mathfrak{su}(E)}$ of $\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{su}(E)$ with $\mathfrak{su}(W^+) \otimes \mathfrak{su}(E)$. We shall generally write $\mathfrak{g}_E = \mathfrak{su}(E)$ henceforth, for convenience.

Unless $\operatorname{Tor}_2 H^2(X;\mathbb{Z}) = 0$, our monopole moduli spaces are labeled in part by a choice of spin^c structure on (X, g) rather than just a choice of characteristic class in $H^2(X;\mathbb{Z})$.

- Given $\mathfrak{t} = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E)$, define (w, p, Λ) by $w = c_1(E)$, $p = p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E)$, and $\Lambda = \frac{1}{2}c_1(V^+)$, or
- Given (w, p, Λ) with $p = w^2 \pmod 4$ and $\Lambda - w \equiv w_2(X) \pmod 2$, we can choose $\mathfrak{t} = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E)$.

We call $\mathfrak{t} = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E)$ a *spin^u structure* on (X, g). Generalized spin^c structures, or spin-G structures, and associated G-monopole equations were described by Witten in [70]; these ideas were further developed by Teleman in [66], [64], where the generalized spin^c structure underlying the PU(2) monopole equations is called a spin-U(2) structure and is equivalent to a spin^u structure. More recently, an elegant repackaging of the PU(2) monopole equations has been described by Mrowka [50].

While our choices of orientations of the PU(2)-monopole moduli spaces may depend on the classes $c_1(W^+)$ or $c_1(E)$, rather than just $\Lambda = c_1(W^+) + c_1(E)$, the moduli spaces of solutions to equations (2.1) for spin^u structures $\mathfrak{t}' = (\rho, W^+ \otimes L, W^- \otimes L, E \otimes L^{-1})$ and $\mathfrak{t} = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E)$ are otherwise identical, for any complex line bundle L. Thus, aside from the issue of orientations, we need not distinguish between such pairs of moduli spaces.

Let $\mathcal{G}_E$ be the Hilbert Lie group of L^2_{k+1} unitary gauge transformations of E with determinant one, with Lie algebra $L^2_{k+1}(\mathfrak{g}_E)$. Our pre-configuration space of pairs on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t}) := \mathcal{A}_E \times L^2_k(V^+),$$

with tangent spaces $L^2_k(\mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_k(V^+)$. We call a pair $(A, \Phi) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})$ a PU(2) *monopole* if

$$\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi) = \begin{pmatrix} F_A^+ - \tau\rho^{-1}(\Phi \otimes \Phi^*)_{00}, \\ D_A\Phi + \rho(\vartheta)\Phi \end{pmatrix} = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

where $D_A = \rho \circ \nabla_A : L^2_k(V^+) \to L^2_{k-1}(V^-)$ is the Dirac operator, while $\tau \in L^2_k(X, \mathrm{GL}(\Lambda^+))$ and $\vartheta \in L^2_k(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathbb{C})$ are perturbation parameters. We let

$$M(\mathfrak{t}) := \{[A, \Phi] \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}) : \ (A, \Phi) \text{ satisfies (2.1)}\},$$

be the moduli space of solutions to (2.1) cut out of the configuration space,

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}) := \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})/\mathcal{G}_E,$$

where $u \in \mathcal{G}_E$ acts by $u(A, \Phi) := (u_*A, u\Phi)$. The linearization of the map $\mathcal{G}_E \to \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})$, $u \mapsto u(A, \Phi)$ at id_E, is given by

$$\zeta \mapsto -d^0_{A,\Phi}(\zeta) := (-d_A\zeta, \zeta\Phi),$$

with L^2-adjoint $d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi}$.

Remark 2.1. Note that we break here with our former convention ([29], [28], [23], [25]) of denoting $M(\mathfrak{t})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ as quotients by $S^1_Z \times_{\{\pm\mathrm{id}_E\}} \mathcal{G}_E$. Our new convention reduces notational clutter and, when we wish to consider quotients by $S^1_Z \times_{\{\pm\mathrm{id}_E\}} \mathcal{G}_E$, we shall simply write $M(\mathfrak{t})/S^1$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})/S^1$, noting that the spaces $M(\mathfrak{t})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ carry a standard action of $S^1_Z \subset \mathrm{U}(2)$ [29].

As customary, we say that an SO(3) connection A on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ is *irreducible* if its stabilizer in $\mathcal{G}_E$ is $\{\pm\mathrm{id}_E\}$, corresponding to the center of SU(2), and *reducible* otherwise; we say that a pair (A, Φ) on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ is irreducible (respectively, reducible) if the connection A

is irreducible (respectively, reducible). We let $\mathcal{C}^*(\mathfrak{t}) \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ be the open subspace of gauge-equivalence classes of irreducible pairs. If $\Phi \equiv 0$ on X, we call (A, Φ) a *zero-section* pair. We let $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathfrak{t}) \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ be the open subspace of gauge-equivalence classes of non-zero-section pairs and recall that $\mathcal{C}^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}) := \mathcal{C}^*(\mathfrak{t}) \cap \mathcal{C}^0(\mathfrak{t})$ is a Hausdorff, Hilbert manifold [29, Proposition 2.12] represented by pairs with stabilizer $\{\mathrm{id}_E\}$ in $\mathcal{G}_E$. Let $M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}) = M(\mathfrak{t}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t})$ be the open subspace of the moduli space $M(\mathfrak{t})$ represented by irreducible, non-zero-section PU(2) monopoles.

Let $\mathcal{B}_E(X) := \mathcal{A}_E(X)/\mathcal{G}_E$ be the quotient of the space of SO(3) connections on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ by the induced action of $\mathcal{G}_E$ on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ and let $\mathcal{A}_E^*(X)$ and $\mathcal{B}_E^*(X)$ be the subspace of irreducible L^2_k connections and its quotient. As before, we may equivalently view $\mathcal{B}_E(X)$ as the quotient space of L^2_k connections on E which induce the fixed connection on $\det E$. Finally, we may view $\mathcal{A}_E \subset \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})$ and $\mathcal{B}_E \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ as the subspace of zero-section pairs and its quotient. Hence, the moduli space of anti-self-dual connections,

$$M_\kappa^w = M_E^{\mathrm{asd}} := \{[A] \in \mathcal{B}_E : F_A^+ = 0\},$$

is identified with the subspace of $M(\mathfrak{t})$ given by zero-section solutions to (2.1).

As in the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1, we further constrain the class w by requiring that no SO(3) bundle P over X with $w_2(P) \equiv w \pmod 2$ admit a flat, reducible connection: a sufficient condition for this to hold is that there exist a spherical class $\beta \in H^2(X;\mathbb{Z})$ for which $\langle w, \beta\rangle \neq 0 \pmod 2$ [47, p. 226]. For any closed four-manifold X and integral class w, the pair $(\hat{X}, \hat{w})$ obeys the Morgan-Mrowka criterion, where $X = X\#\bar{\mathbb{CP}}^2$ and $\hat{w} = w + \mathrm{PD}(e)$, with e the class of the exceptional curve in $\hat{X}$. Here, the Morgan-Mrowka criterion ensures that the Uhlenbeck compactification $\bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$ contains no reducible, zero-section pairs if $b^+(X) > 0$ and the metric g is generic (see Propositions 2.9(1) and 3.1(3) and Lemma 3.3 in [23]). The Morgan-Mrowka condition can always be satisfied by blowing up if necessary and so, as far as the computation of Donaldson or Seiberg-Witten invariants is concerned, there is no loss in generality (because of [41, Theorem 6.9], [30, Theorem 1.4]).

2.2. Uhlenbeck compactness and transversality for PU(2) monopoles.

We briefly recall our Uhlenbeck compactness and transversality results [17], [29] for the moduli space of PU(2) monopoles with the perturbations discussed in the preceding section. The moduli space of PU(2) monopoles is non-compact but has an Uhlenbeck closure analogous to that of the moduli space of anti-self-dual connections on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ [12, §4.4].

We say that a sequence of points $[A_\alpha, \Phi_\alpha]$ in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ *converges* to a point $[A, \Phi, \mathbf{x}]$ in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell) \times \mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$, where $\mathfrak{t}_\ell = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E_\ell)$ and E_ℓ is a Hermitian two-plane bundle over X such that

$$\det(E_\ell) = \det E \quad \text{and} \quad c_2(E_\ell) = c_2(E) - \ell, \quad \text{with} \quad \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},$$

if the following hold:

- There is a sequence of $L^2_{k+1,\mathrm{loc}}$ determinant-one, unitary bundle isomorphisms $u_\alpha : E|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}} \to E_\ell|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}}$ such that the sequence of monopoles $u_\alpha(A_\alpha, \Phi_\alpha)$ converges to (A, Φ) in $L^2_{k,\mathrm{loc}}$ over $X \setminus \mathbf{x}$, and
- The sequence of measures $|F_{A_\beta}|^2$ converges in the weak-* topology on measures to $|F_A|^2 + 8\pi^2 \sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}} \delta(x)$.

Given a Hermitian two-plane bundle E, we call the intersection of $\bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$ with $M(\mathfrak{t}_\ell) \times \mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$ a *lower-level* of the compactification $\bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$ if $\ell > 0$ and call $M(\mathfrak{t})$ the *top* or *highest level*.

Theorem 2.2. [29] *Let X be a closed, oriented, smooth four-manifold with C^∞ Riemannian metric, spin^c structure (ρ, W^+, W^-) with spin^c connection on $W = W^+ \oplus W^-$, and a Hermitian two-plane bundle E with unitary connection on $\det E$. Then there is a positive integer N_p, depending at most on the curvatures of the fixed connections on W and $\det E$ together with $c_2(E)$, such that for all $N \geq N_p$ the topological space $\bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$ is second countable, Hausdorff, compact, and given by the closure of $M(\mathfrak{t})$ in the space of* ideal PU(2) monopoles $\sqcup_{\ell=0}^N (M(\mathfrak{t}_\ell) \times \mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$ *with respect to the Uhlenbeck topology, where E_ℓ is a Hermitian two-plane bundle over X with $\det E_\ell = \det E$ and $c_2(E_\ell) = c_2(E) - \ell$ for each integer $\ell \geq 0$.*

Theorem 2.2 is a special case of the more general result proved in [29] for the moduli space of solutions to the PU(2) monopole equations in the presence of holonomy perturbations. The existence of an Uhlenbeck compactification for the moduli space of solutions to the unperturbed PU(2) monopole equations (2.1) was announced by Pidstrigach [53] and an argument was outlined in [54]. A similar argument for the equations (2.1) (without perturbations) was outlined by Okonek and Teleman in [52]. An independent proof of Uhlenbeck compactness for (2.1) and other perturbations of these equations is also given in [65].

We recall from [29, Equation (2.25)] that the elliptic deformation complex for the moduli space $M(\mathfrak{t})$ is given by

$$L^2_{k+1}(\mathfrak{g}_E) \xrightarrow{d^0_{A,\Phi}} \begin{array}{c} L^2_k(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \\ \oplus \\ L^2_k(V^+) \end{array} \xrightarrow{d^1_{A,\Phi}} \begin{array}{c} L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \\ \oplus \\ L^2_{k-1}(V^-) \end{array} \tag{2.2}$$

with elliptic deformation operator

$$\mathcal{D}_{A,\Phi} := d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi} + d^1_{A,\Phi} \tag{2.3}$$

and cohomology $H^\bullet_{A,\Phi}$. Here, $d^1_{A,\Phi}$ is the linearization at the pair (A, Φ) of the gauge-equivariant map $\mathfrak{S}$ defined by the equations (2.1), so

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}(a, \phi) := (D\mathfrak{S})_{A,\Phi}(a, \phi) = \begin{pmatrix} d^+_A a - \frac{1}{2}\tau\rho^{-1}(\phi \otimes \Phi^* + \Phi \otimes \phi^*)_{00} \\ (D_A + \rho(\vartheta))\phi + \rho(a)\Phi \end{pmatrix}.$$

The space $H^0_{A,\Phi} = \operatorname{Ker} d^0_{A,\Phi}$ is the Lie algebra of the stabilizer $\mathrm{Stab}_{A,\Phi}$ in $\mathcal{G}_E$ of a pair (A, Φ) and $H^1_{A,\Phi}$ is the Zariski tangent space to $M(\mathfrak{t})$ at a point $[A, \Phi]$. If $H^2_{A,\Phi} = 0$, then $[A, \Phi]$ is a regular point of the zero locus of the PU(2) monopole equations (2.1) on $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$.

We now turn to the question of transversality. Recall that a real-linear map $\rho : T^*X \to \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(W)$ defines a Clifford-algebra representation $\rho : \mathrm{Cl}_{\mathbb{C}}(T^*X) \to \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(W)$ if and only if [45], [56]

$$\rho(\alpha)^\dagger = -\rho(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\alpha)^\dagger \rho(\alpha) = g(\alpha, \alpha)\mathrm{id}_W, \qquad \alpha \in C^\infty(T^*X), \tag{2.4}$$

where g denotes the Riemannian metric on T^*X.

For the Riemannian metric g on T^*X, let ∇^g be an SO(4) connection on T^*X. A unitary connection ∇ on W is called *spinorial with respect to* ∇^g if it induces the SO(4) connection

∇^g on T^*X, or, equivalently, if

$$[\nabla_\eta, \rho(\alpha)] = \rho(\nabla^g_\eta \alpha), \tag{2.5}$$

for all $\eta \in C^\infty(TX)$ and $\alpha \in \Omega^1(X, \mathbb{R})$. The unitary connection ∇ on W uniquely determines a unitary connection on $\det W^+ \simeq \det W^-$. Any two unitary connections on W, which are both spinorial with respect to ∇^g, differ by an element of $\Omega^1(X, i\mathbb{R})$. Conversely, a unitary connection ∇ on a Hermitian four-plane bundle $W = W^+ \oplus W^-$ over an oriented four-manifold X is uniquely determined by

- A Clifford map $\rho : T^*X \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(W^+, W^-)$ satisfying (2.4) for the Riemannian metric g on T^*X,
- An SO(4) connection ∇^g on T^*X for the metric g, which need not be torsion free, and,
- A unitary connection on $\det W^+$.

The resulting connection ∇ on W is then spinorial with respect to ∇^g; we call ∇ a *spin*^{c} connection if ∇^g is the Levi-Civita connection. The Dirac operator D_A is not self-adjoint on $C^\infty(W \otimes E)$ unless the SO(4) connection ∇^g is torsion-free, so ∇^g is the Levi-Civita connection, as one can see from examples.

Given a Riemannian metric g, Clifford map ρ, and unitary connection on $\det W^+$, the Dirac operators D^g_A and D^{LC}_A defined by any SO(4) connection ∇^g and by the Levi-Civita connection ∇^{LC} on T^*X differ by an element $\rho(\vartheta') \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(W^+, W^-)$ [17, Lemma 3.1], where $\vartheta' \in \Omega^1(X, \mathbb{C})$. Even though a fixed unitary connection on W will not necessarily induce a torsion-free connection on T^*X for generic pairs (g, ρ) of Riemannian metrics and compatible Clifford maps, we can assume that the Dirac operator D_A in (2.1) is defined using the Levi-Civita connection for the metric g by absorbing the difference term $\rho(\vartheta')$ into the perturbation term $\rho(\vartheta)$. Given any fixed pair (g_0, ρ_0) satisfying (2.4) and automorphism $f \in C^\infty(\mathrm{GL}(T^*X))$, then $(g, \rho) := (f^*g_0, f^*\rho_0)$ is again a compatible pair; the pair (g, ρ) is *generic* if f is generic.

Theorem 2.3. [17] *Let X be a closed, oriented, smooth four-manifold with Hermitian two-plane bundles (W^+, W^-) with unitary connection on $\det W^+$, and a Hermitian line bundle $\det E$ with unitary connection. Then for a generic, C^∞ pair (g, ρ) satisfying (2.4) and generic, C^∞ parameters (τ, ϑ), the moduli space $M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}, g, \rho, \tau, \vartheta)$ of PU(2) monopoles is a smooth manifold of the expected dimension,*

$$\begin{aligned}\dim M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}, g, \rho, \tau, \vartheta) &= \dim M^{*,\mathrm{asd}}_E(g) + 2 \operatorname{Index}_{\mathbb{C}} D_A \\ &= -2p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E) - 3(1 - b^1(X) + b^+(X)) \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{2}p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E) + \tfrac{1}{2}(\Lambda^2 - b^+(X) + b^-(X)),\end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda := \frac{1}{2}c_1(V^+) = c_1(W^+) + c_1(E)$.

Theorem 2.3 was proved independently, using a somewhat different method, by A. Teleman [65].

Note that $\dim M^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t})$ depends only on χ, σ, Λ, and $p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E)$: in particular, it does not depend on $c_1(W^+)$, $w = c_1(E)$, or even $w_2(\mathfrak{g}_E) = w \pmod 2$, but only on $\Lambda = c_1(W^+) + c_1(E) = \frac{1}{2}c_1(V^+)$.

Remark 2.4. In Theorem 2.3, the Dirac operator D_A of (2.1) is defined by the unitary connection on $\det W^+$, Levi-Civita connection on T^*X for the metric g, and the Clifford map ρ, together with the unitary connection on E induced by that on $\det E$ and by an SO(3) connection A on $\mathfrak{g}_E$. To reduce notational clutter and when it makes no difference to the argument at hand, we shall often write $D_{A,\vartheta}$ or even simply D_A for the perturbation Dirac operator $D_A + \rho(\vartheta)$ on $\Gamma(V^+)$, regarding the perturbation $\vartheta \in \Omega^1(X, \mathbb{C})$ as a component of the connection A_d on $\det W^+$, now simply viewed as a complex rather than a unitary connection.

For the remainder of this article, we shall write the expected dimensions appearing in the statement of Theorem 2.3 as

$$\begin{aligned} d_a(\mathfrak{g}_E) := \dim M_E^{\text{asd}} &= -2p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E) - 3(1 - b^1(X) + b^+(X)) \\ &= -2p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E) - \tfrac{3}{2}(\chi(X) + \sigma(X)), \\ 2n_a(\mathfrak{g}_E, \Lambda) := 2\,\text{Index}_{\mathbb{C}}\, D_A &= \tfrac{1}{2}p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E) + \tfrac{1}{2}(\Lambda^2 - \sigma(X)), \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where $\chi(X)$ and $\sigma(X)$ are the Euler class and signature of X, respectively.

3. Splicing extended PU(2) monopoles

We construct a *splicing map* $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'$ which will give a homeomorphism from the total space of a gluing data bundle into an open neighborhood in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ of a level $M(\mathfrak{t}) \times \Sigma$, where $\Sigma \subset \text{Sym}^\ell(X)$ is a smooth stratum. When defining our spaces of connections and gauge transformations, we shall always choose to work L^2_k connections modulo L^2_{k+1} gauge transformations with $k \geq 4$: though only $k \geq 2$ is strictly necessary, we shall occasionally need to consider estimates whose constants depend on the C^0 norm of F_A (on a subset of X where A does not bubble) or C^1 norm of Φ. Thus, *for the remainder of this article and its sequels* we shall assume $k \geq 4$ in order to make use of the Sobolev embedding $L^2_4 \subset C^1$.

3.1. Gluing data.

In this section we describe the gluing-data bundles we shall need to parameterize an open neighborhood in $\bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$ of a level $(M(\mathfrak{t}_\ell) \times \Sigma) \cap \bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$.

3.1.1. *Connections over the four-sphere.* We begin by defining the required gluing data associated with the four-spheres: this will, essentially, define the fibers of our gluing-data bundles. Let $\kappa \geq 1$ be an integer and let S^4 have its standard round metric of radius one. Let E be a Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle over S^4 with $c_2(E) = \kappa$ and let $\mathfrak{g}_E = \mathfrak{su}(E)$ be the corresponding SO(3) bundle with $-\frac{1}{4}p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E) = \kappa$.

A choice of frame f in the principal SO(4) frame bundle $\text{Fr}(TS^4)$ for TS^4, over the north pole $n \in S^4$, defines a conformal diffeomorphism,

$$\varphi_n : \mathbb{R}^4 \to S^4 \setminus \{s\}, \tag{3.1}$$

that is inverse to a stereographic projection from the south pole $s \in S^4 \subset \mathbb{R}^5$; let $y(\,\cdot\,) : S^4 \setminus \{s\} \to \mathbb{R}^4$ be the corresponding coordinate chart.

Definition 3.1. [61, pp. 343–344] Continue the notation of the preceding paragraph. The *center* $z = z([A], f) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and the *scale* $\lambda = \lambda([A], f)$ of a point $[A] \in \mathcal{B}_E(S^4) = \mathcal{B}_\kappa(S^4)$ are defined by

$$z([A],f) := \frac{1}{8\pi^2\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} y|F_A|^2\,d^4y, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\lambda([A],f)^2 := \frac{1}{8\pi^2\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |y-z([A],f)|^2|F_A|^2\,d^4y. \tag{3.3}$$

A point $[A]$ is *mass-centered* if $z([A],f)=0$ and *centered* if it also obeys $\lambda([A],f)=1$. An *ideal point* $[A,\mathbf{x}]\in\mathcal{B}_{\kappa-\ell}(S^4)\times\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(S^4)$ is *mass-centered* if $z([A,\mathbf{x}],f)=0$, where the center and scale are defined by replacing $|F_A|^2$ with $|F_A|^2+8\pi^2\sum_{x\in\mathbf{x}}\delta_x$ in equations (3.2), with the analogous definition holding for *centered* ideal points.

For any $(\lambda,z)\in\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^4$, we define a conformal diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^4$ by

$$f_{\lambda,z}:\mathbb{R}^4\to\mathbb{R}^4,\qquad y\mapsto(y-z)/\lambda. \tag{3.4}$$

It is easy to see that the point $[(f^{-1}_{\lambda,z})^*A]$ is centered if $z=z([A],f)$ and $\lambda=\lambda([A],f)$. Via the standard action of $\mathrm{SO}(4)\subset\mathrm{GL}(\mathbb{R}^4)$ on $\mathbb{R}^4$ and the conformal diffeomorphism $\varphi_n^{-1}:S^4\setminus\{s\}\to\mathbb{R}^4$, we obtain a homomorphism from $\mathrm{SO}(4)$ into the group of conformal diffeomorphisms of S^4 fixing the south pole s. The group $\mathrm{SO}(4)$ acts on the quotient space of connections based at the south pole, $\mathcal{B}^s_\kappa(S^4)\cong\mathcal{A}_\kappa(S^4)\times_{\mathcal{G}_E}\mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_E)|_s$, by

$$\mathrm{SO}(4)\times\mathcal{B}^s_\kappa(S^4)\to\mathcal{B}^s_\kappa(S^4),\quad (u,[A,q])\mapsto u\cdot[A,q]=[(u^{-1})^*A,q]. \tag{3.5}$$

The assignment $f\mapsto z([A],f)$ is $\mathrm{SO}(4)$-equivariant, that is, $z([A],uf)=uz([A],f)$ for $u\in\mathrm{SO}(4)$, and so $\lambda[A]=\lambda([A],f)$ is independent of the choice of $f\in\mathrm{Fr}(TS^4)|_n$. The center and scale functions define a smooth map $(z,\lambda):\mathcal{B}_\kappa(S^4)\to\mathbb{R}^4\times\mathbb{R}^+$ and the preimage of $(0,1)\in\mathbb{R}^4\times\mathbb{R}^+$, namely the codimension-five submanifold of *centered connections*

$$\mathcal{B}^\diamond_\kappa(S^4) := \{[A]: z[A]=0 \text{ and } \lambda[A]=1\}\subset\mathcal{B}_\kappa(S^4), \tag{3.6}$$

serves as a canonical slice for the action of $\mathbb{R}^4\times\mathbb{R}^+$ on $\mathcal{B}_\kappa(S^4)$; the preimage of $0\in\mathbb{R}^4$, namely the codimension-four submanifold of *mass-centered connections*

$$\mathcal{B}^\natural_\kappa(S^4) := \{[A]: z[A]=0\}\subset\mathcal{B}_\kappa(S^4), \tag{3.7}$$

serves as a canonical slice for the action of $\mathbb{R}^4$ on $\mathcal{B}_\kappa(S^4)$. We simply write $z[A]$ when the frame f for $TS^4|_n$ is understood, employ the decoration $\natural$ to indicate a subspace of mass-centered connections, and employ the decoration $\diamond$ to indicate a subspace of centered connections. Since the action of $\mathrm{SO}(4)$ preserves the north and south poles of S^4, it acts on $\mathcal{B}^{\natural,s}_\kappa(S^4)$, and so $\mathcal{B}^{\natural,s}_\kappa(S^4)$ admits an action of $\mathrm{SO}(3)\times\mathrm{SO}(4)$, with $\mathrm{SO}(3)$ varying the frame of $\mathfrak{g}_E|_s$; the same holds for the spaces of centered connections.

A simple *a priori* decay estimate for the curvature of connections is provided by the Chebychev inequality:

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $[A]\in\mathcal{B}_\kappa(S^4)$ *and suppose* $z([A],f)=0$*. If* $\lambda=\lambda[A]$ *and* $R>0$*, then*

$$\frac{1}{8\pi^2\kappa}\int_{|y|\geq R\lambda}|F_A|^2\,d^4y\leq R^{-2}.$$

Proof. From equation (3.3) we see that

$$\lambda^2 \geq \frac{1}{8\pi^2\kappa}\int_{|y|\geq R\lambda} |y|^2|F_A|^2\,d^4y \geq \frac{R^2\lambda^2}{8\pi^2\kappa}\int_{|y|\geq R\lambda} |F_A|^2\,d^4y$$

and this gives the required bound. □

An immediate consequence of the Chebychev inequality is that if A is a centered anti-self-dual connection over S^4, with second Chern number κ so its energy is equal to $8\pi^2\kappa$, then A cannot bubble outside the ball $B(0,1/2\pi)\subset\mathbb{R}^4$, as it has most energy $4\pi^2$ in this region by Lemma 3.2.

We let $M^\diamond_\kappa(S^4)\subset\mathcal{B}^\diamond_\kappa(S^4)$ denote the subspace of anti-self-dual connections, centered at the north pole, while $M^s_\kappa(S^4)\subset\mathcal{B}^s_\kappa(S^4)$ is the subspace of anti-self-dual connections, framed at the south pole. Finally, we let $M^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)\subset\mathcal{B}^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)$ denote the subspace of anti-self-dual connections, which framed at the south pole and centered at the north pole. The definition of Uhlenbeck convergence (see, for example, §2.2) for sequences of points $[A_\alpha]$ in $\mathcal{B}_\kappa(S^4)$ generalizes easily to the case of sequences $[A_\alpha,q_\alpha]$ in $\mathcal{B}^s_\kappa(S^4)$, when $\mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_E|_s)\cong\mathrm{SO}(3)$ is given its usual topology. Since Lemma 3.2 implies that points in $M^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)$ cannot bubble near the south pole, the proof of [12, Theorem 4.4.3] adapts with no change to show that $M^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)$ has compact closure $\bar M^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)$ in the space of framed, ideal anti-self-dual connections,

$$\bigsqcup_{\ell=0}^{\kappa}\left(M^s_{\kappa-\ell}(S^4)\times\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(S^4)\right).$$

Note that it is the ideal points $[A_0,\mathbf{x}]$ in $\bar M^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)$ which are centered in the sense of Definition 3.1 and not the background connections A_0. Note also that the points in $S^4=\mathbb{R}^4\cup\{\infty\}$ representing the multisets $\mathbf{x}$ will be constrained to lie in the ball $\bar B(0,1/2\pi)$ by Lemma 3.2.

Observe that since the bundle map u in the definition of an Uhlenbeck neighborhood respects the SO(3) action on frames, there is a global action of SO(3) on the space $\bar M^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)$. This action is free on all strata except $[\Theta]\times\mathrm{Sym}^\kappa(S^4)$, where the background connection is trivial. In addition, the SO(4) action on $M^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)$ extends over $\bar M^{\diamond,s}_\kappa(S^4)$.

3.1.2. *Gluing data bundles.* We now define bundles of gluing data, $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell,\Sigma,\lambda_0)$, associated with a choice of spin^u structure $\mathfrak{t}$ on (X,g), smooth stratum $\Sigma\subset\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$, precompact open submanifold $\mathcal{U}_\ell\subset\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)$, and positive constant λ_0. Our definition is motivated by those of Friedman-Morgan [34, §§3.4.2–3.4.4], Kotschick-Morgan [42, §4], and Taubes [61], [62].

If $\mathfrak{t}=(\rho,W^+,W^-,E)$, we denote $\kappa=-\frac{1}{4}p_1(\mathfrak{su}(E))$. The integer ℓ obeys $1\leq\ell\leq\lfloor\kappa\rfloor$ and we let $\Sigma\subset\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$ be a smooth stratum, defined by an integer partition $\kappa_1\geq\cdots\geq\kappa_m\geq 1$ of ℓ such that $\kappa_1+\cdots+\kappa_m=\ell$. Let E_ℓ be the Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle over X with $\det E_\ell=\det E$ and $c_2(E_\ell)=c_2(E)-\ell$, so that $\mathfrak{t}_\ell=(\rho,W^+,W^-,E_\ell)$. Let $\mathrm{Fr}(TX)$ denote the principal SO(4) bundle of oriented, g-orthonormal frames for TX. Suppose $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\ell\subset\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)$ projects to the submanifold $\mathcal{U}_\ell$. Observe that the fibered product

$$\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\ell\times_{\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)}\prod_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})\times_X\mathrm{Fr}(TX))\to\mathcal{U}_\ell\times\prod_{i=1}^m X \tag{3.8}$$

is a principal $\prod_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{SO}(3)\times\mathrm{SO}(4))$ bundle. Let $\Delta\subset\prod_{i=1}^m X$ be the full diagonal, that is, the subset of m-tuples of points in X where some point occurs with multiplicity at least two. Let $\mathfrak{S}=\mathfrak{S}_\Sigma=\mathfrak{S}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m)$ be the largest subgroup of the symmetric group on m symbols which preserves the multiplicities. The group $\mathfrak{S}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m)$ acts freely on $\prod_{i=1}^m X-\Delta$ and we have an identification

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^m X-\Delta\right)/\mathfrak{S}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m)=\Sigma\subset\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X).$$

The group $\mathfrak{S}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m)$ acts on the fibered product bundle (3.8) to give a principal bundle

$$\mathbf{Fr}(\mathcal{U}_\ell,\Sigma)\to\mathcal{U}_\ell\times\Sigma, \tag{3.9}$$

with total space

$$\mathbf{Fr}(\mathcal{U}_\ell,\Sigma):=\left(\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_\ell\times_{\mathcal{G}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)}\prod_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})\times_X\mathrm{Fr}(TX))\right)|_{\prod_{i=1}^m X-\Delta} \tag{3.10}$$

and structure group

$$\mathbf{G}(\Sigma)=\mathbf{G}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m):=\left(\prod_{i=1}^m(\mathrm{SO}(3)\times\mathrm{SO}(4))\right)\rtimes\mathfrak{S}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m). \tag{3.11}$$

Let S^4 have its standard round metric of radius one, let $E^1,\dots,E^m$ be Hermitian, rank-two vector bundles over S^4 with $c_2(E^j)=\kappa_j$ for $j=1,\dots,m$, and let $\mathfrak{g}_{E^j}\equiv\mathfrak{su}(E^j)$ be the corresponding SO(3) bundles with $-\frac{1}{4}p_1(\mathfrak{g}_{E^j})=\kappa_j$. Denote $\mathbb{R}^+:=(0,\infty)$. The smooth manifold

$$\mathbf{Z}(\Sigma)=\mathbf{Z}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m):=\prod_{i=1}^m\left(\tilde{M}^\diamond_{E^i}\times_{\mathcal{G}_{E^i}}\mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_{E^i})|_s\times\mathbb{R}^+\right) \tag{3.12}$$

carries a natural action of $\mathbf{G}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m)$ coming from the action of SO(4) rotating S^4 and the action of SO(3) on the choice of frame for $\mathfrak{g}_{E^i}|_s$ in each factor, and the action of $\mathfrak{S}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m)$ permuting the factors whose underlying bundles are isomorphic. The bundle $\mathrm{Fr}(TX)$ has its usual right SO(4) action given by

$$\mathrm{SO}(4)\times\mathrm{Fr}(TX)\to\mathrm{Fr}(TX),\quad (u,f)\mapsto fu^{-1}. \tag{3.13}$$

We form the fibered product

$$\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell,\Sigma):=\mathbf{Fr}(\mathcal{U}_\ell,\Sigma)\times_{\mathbf{G}(\Sigma)}\mathbf{Z}(\Sigma), \tag{3.14}$$

together with the natural projection map

$$\pi:\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell,\Sigma)\to\mathcal{U}_\ell\times\Sigma. \tag{3.15}$$

This is a locally trivial fiber bundle with structure group $\mathbf{G}(\kappa_1,\dots,\kappa_m)$. We let $\mathbf{Z}(\Sigma,\lambda_0)\subset\mathbf{Z}(\Sigma)$ denote the open subspace obtained by replacing $\mathbb{R}^+$ by $(0,\lambda_0)$ in the definition (3.12) and let $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell,\Sigma,\lambda_0)$ denote the corresponding gluing data bundle.

3.2. Splicing pairs over X.

In this section we describe the *splicing construction* for pairs on $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V^+)$ via a partition of unity on X and define the *splicing maps* $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'$ for pairs. Our description is largely motivated by those of Taubes in [58], [59], [60], [61, §4], [62]. We keep the notation of §3.1.

3.2.1. *Cutting and splicing pairs.* Fix a smooth stratum $\Sigma \subset \mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$, let $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma$, and choose $r_0 = r_0(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ to be one half the smaller of

- The minimum geodesic distance between distinct points x_i, x_j of the representative $(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ of $\mathbf{x}$, and
- The injectivity radius of the Riemannian manifold (X, g).

A choice of L^2_k connection A_0 on $\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}$ and SO(3) frames $p_i \in \mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})|_{x_i}$ define L^2_{k+1} local sections of $\mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})$,

$$\sigma_i = \sigma_i(A_0, p_i) : B(x_i, r_0) \to \mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}), \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

using parallel transport along radial geodesics emanating from x_i together with smoothing for sections of $\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}$ using the heat kernel $\exp(-t d^*_{A_0} d_{A_0})$ for small t, as described in [29, §A.1]; see also the remarks in [62, p. 177]. We shall ultimately confine our attention to the case where (A_0, Φ_0) is a solution to an (extended) PU(2) monopole equation, in which case the L^2_k pair (A_0, Φ_0) is L^2_{k+1}-gauge equivalent to a C^∞ pair by Proposition 3.7 in [29] (which, though only stated for the PU(2) monopole equations, also holds for extended equations). Hence, when we are splicing background pairs which are (extended) PU(2) monopoles, then the heat-kernel smoothing described above is not required as all pairs, connections, and trivializations can be assumed to be C^∞. Let

$$\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}|_{B(x_i, r_0)} \simeq B(x_i, r_0) \times \mathrm{SO}(3) \tag{3.16}$$

be the L^2_{k+1} local trivializations defined by the sections σ_i.

Define a smooth cutoff function $\chi_{x_0,\varepsilon} : X \to [0, 1]$ by setting

$$\chi_{x_0,\varepsilon}(x) := \chi(\mathrm{dist}(x, x_0)/\varepsilon) \tag{3.17}$$

where $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ is a smooth function such that $\chi(t) = 1$ for $t \geq 1$ and $\chi(t) = 0$ for $t \leq 1/2$. Thus, we have

$$\chi_{x_0,\varepsilon}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in X - B(x_0, \varepsilon), \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in B(x_0, \varepsilon/2). \end{cases}$$

We define a cut-off connection on the bundle $\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}$ over X by setting

$$\chi_{\mathbf{x},4\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}} A_0 := \begin{cases} A_0 & \text{over } X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}), \\ \Gamma + \chi_{x_i,4\sqrt{\lambda_i}} \sigma_i^* A_0 & \text{over } \Omega(x_i, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}), \\ \Gamma & \text{over } B(x_i, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}), \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

where Γ denotes the product connection on $B(x_i, r_0) \times \mathrm{SO}(3)$, while $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$.

Similarly, we define a cut-off spinor on the bundles V^+_ℓ and V^+ over X by setting

$$\Phi \equiv \chi_{\mathbf{x},8\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{1/3}} \Phi_0 := \begin{cases} \Phi_0 & \text{over } X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}), \\ \chi_{x_i,8\lambda_i^{1/3}} \sigma_i^* A_0 & \text{over } \Omega(x_i, 4\lambda_i^{1/3}, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}), \\ 0 & \text{over } B(x_i, 4\lambda_i^{1/3}), \end{cases} \tag{3.19}$$

with the same notation. The reason for the different choice of annulus radii will be explained in §8.

Let A_i be centered L^2_k connections on the bundles $\mathfrak{g}_{E^i}$ over S^4. Let

$$\tau_i = \tau_i(A_i, q_i) : S^4 \setminus \{n\} \to \mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_{E^i}), \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

be the analogously-defined L^2_{k+1} local sections induced by the connections $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_{E^i}$ and SO(3) frames $q_i \in \mathrm{Fr}(\mathfrak{g}_{E^i})|_s$. Let

$$\mathfrak{g}_{E^i}|_{S^4\setminus\{n\}} \simeq S^4 \setminus \{n\} \times \mathrm{SO}(3) \tag{3.20}$$

be the L^2_{k+1} local trivializations defined by the τ_i. Let $\delta_\lambda : S^4 \to S^4$ be the conformal diffeomorphism of S^4 defined by

$$\delta_\lambda := \varphi_n \circ \lambda \circ \varphi_n^{-1}, \tag{3.21}$$

where $\lambda : \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}^4$ is the dilation given by $y \mapsto y/\lambda$, so δ_λ is a conformal diffeomorphism of S^4 which fixes the north and south poles. We define cut-off, rescaled connections on the bundles $\mathfrak{g}_{E^i}$ over S^4, with mass centers at the north pole, by setting

$$(1 - \chi_{x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2})\delta^*_{\lambda_i} A_i := \begin{cases} \delta^*_{\lambda_i} A_i & \text{over } \varphi_n(B(0, \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda_i})), \\ \Gamma + (1 - \chi_{x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2})\tau_i^*\delta^*_{\lambda_i} A_i & \text{over } \varphi_n(\Omega(0, \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda_i}, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i})), \\ \Gamma & \text{over } S^4 - \varphi_n(B(0, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i})), \end{cases} \tag{3.22}$$

where Γ denotes the product connection on $(S^4 - \{n\}) \times \mathrm{SO}(3)$. Note that $\tau_i^*\delta^*_{\lambda_i} A_i = \delta^*_{\lambda_i}\tau_i^* A_i$, since the section τ_i is defined by parallel translation from the south pole via the connection A_i.

A choice of SO(4) frames $f_i \in \mathrm{Fr}(TX)|_{x_i}$ defines coordinate charts

$$\varphi_i^{-1} : B(x_i, r_0) \subset X \to \mathbb{R}^4, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

via the exponential maps $\exp_{f_i} : B(0, r_0) \subset TX|_{x_i} \to X$. The orientation-preserving diffeomorphism $\varphi_i \circ \varphi_n^{-1}$ identifies the annulus $\varphi_n(\Omega(0, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}))$ in S^4,

$$\Omega\left(0, \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}\right) := \varphi_n\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i} < |x| < 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}\right\}\right) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$$

with the annulus in X,

$$\Omega\left(x_i, \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}\right) := \left\{x \in X : \tfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i} < \mathrm{dist}_g(x, x_i) < 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}\right\} \subset X.$$

We define a glued-up SO(3) bundle $\mathfrak{g}_E$ over X by setting

$$\mathfrak{g}_E = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell} & \text{over } X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i}), \\ \mathfrak{g}_{E^i} & \text{over } B(x_i, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}). \end{cases} \tag{3.23}$$

The bundles $\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{E^i}$ are identified over the annuli $\Omega(x_i, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}\})$ in X via the isomorphisms of SO(3) bundles defined by the orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms $\varphi_i \circ \varphi_n^{-1}$, identifying the annuli $\Omega(x_i, \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}\})$ with the corresponding annuli in S^4 and the SO(3) bundle maps defined by the trivializations (3.16) and (3.20). Define a spliced L^2_k connection A on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ by setting

$$A := \begin{cases} A_0 & \text{over } X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}), \\ \Gamma + \chi_{x_i,4\sqrt{\lambda_i}} A_0 + (1 - \chi_{x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2})\delta^*_{\lambda_i} A_i & \text{over } \Omega(x_i, \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}), \\ \delta^*_{\lambda_i} A_i & \text{over } B(x_i, \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda_i}),\ i = 1, \dots, m, \end{cases} \tag{3.24}$$

where the cut-off connections are defined as above; the bundle and annulus identifications are understood. Also implicit in definitions (3.19) and (3.24) are the following constraints on the scales, given an m-tuple of distinct points, $(x_1, \dots, x_m)$,

$$8\sqrt{\lambda_i} + 8\sqrt{\lambda_j} < \operatorname{dist}_g(x_i, x_j), \quad i \neq j, \tag{3.25}$$

representing a multiset $\mathbf{x} \in \Sigma$. The *splicing map*, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'$, is defined on the open subset of the gluing-data bundle, $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell, \Sigma)$ in definition (3.14), defined by

$$\mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_\ell, \Sigma) := \{\pi^{-1}([A_0, \Phi_0], \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell, \Sigma) : (\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{x}) \text{ obeys (3.25)}\}. \tag{3.26}$$

We shall normally require that the scales $\lambda_i = \lambda[A_i]$ be "sufficiently small" (the precise requirement will emerge in §9) and so we shall write

$$\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell, \Sigma, \lambda_0) \subset \mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_\ell, \Sigma),$$

for the open subset defined by the requirement that $\lambda[A_i] < \lambda_0$ for all i, for some positive constant λ_0, when this bound is significant.

It remains to summarize what the splicing construction has achieved. The construction, thus far, yields a splicing map giving a smooth embedding

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}' : \mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_\ell, \Sigma, \lambda_0) \to \mathcal{C}^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t}) \tag{3.27}$$

The fact that the map is a smooth embedding is a fairly straightforward consequence of the definitions; it will follow from the stronger result in [26] that the gluing map $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ gives a smooth embedding of the gluing data. Similarly, the fact that the image of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'$ contains only irreducible, non-zero-section pairs is also a fairly easy consequence of the definitions; it is proved in [26].

4. Regularity of solutions to extended PU(2) monopole equations

In this section we recall the basic regularity results for solutions to the PU(2) monopole equations (2.1): these were proved in [29], so we just summarize the conclusions here, as well as proving regularity for (gluing) solutions to the *extended* PU(2) *monopole equations* (see §9.1). In common with the anti-self-dual equations considered by Taubes in [60], [62], there are obstructions to solving the full PU(2) monopole equations (2.1) and so we shall only prove existence of solutions to the weaker 'extended PU(2) monopole equations', described in §9.1.

To encompass the regularity theory for these extended monopole equations, it will be convenient to consider a more general, inhomogeneous version of the equations (2.1). Therefore, as in [29, §3], we examine a quasi-linear, inhomogeneous elliptic system consisting of a generalization of the equations (2.1) and Coulomb gauge equation for a pair $(A, \Phi) + (a, \phi) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})$ relative to (A, Φ). As before, we choose $\ell \geq 4$ (so that $L^2_\ell \subset C^1$, with $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})$ the pre-configuration space of L^2_ℓ pairs acted on by $L^2_{\ell+1}$ gauge transformations, $\mathcal{G}_E$. Combining (2.1) with the Coulomb gauge equation, and allowing inhomogeneous terms, we obtain an elliptic system of equations for a pair (a, ϕ) in $L^2_\ell(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_\ell(V^+)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi}(a, \phi) &= \zeta, \\ \mathfrak{S}(A + a, \Phi + \phi) &= (w_0, s_0). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Considering A to be a connection on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ and using the isomorphism $\operatorname{ad} : \mathfrak{g}_E \to \mathfrak{so}(\mathfrak{g}_E)$ to view F_A as a section of $\Lambda^2 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E$, we write (4.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} d_A^* a - (\cdot\Phi)^*\phi &= \zeta, \\ F_{A+a}^+ - \tau\rho^{-1}((\Phi+\phi)\otimes(\Phi+\phi)^*)_{00} &= w_0, \\ (D_{A+a} + \rho(\vartheta))(\Phi+\phi) &= s_0, \end{aligned}$$

where $(w_0, s_0) \in L^2_{\ell-1}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_{\ell-1}(V^-)$. Recalling that $d^0_{A,\Phi}$ and $d^1_{A,\Phi}$ are the differential operators in the elliptic deformation complex [29, Equation (2.37)] for the PU(2) monopole equations (2.1), the above system may be rewritten in the form

$$\begin{aligned} d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi) &= \zeta, \\ d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi) + \{(a,\phi),(a,\phi)\} &= -\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi) + (w_0, s_0) =: (w, s), \end{aligned}$$

where the differentials $d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi}$ and $d^1_{A,\Phi}$ are given by [29, Equations (2.38) & (2.36)], respectively. It will be convenient to view the quadratic term $\{(a,\phi),(a,\phi)\}$ as being defined via the following bilinear form,

$$\{(a,\phi),(b,\varphi)\} := \begin{pmatrix} (a\wedge b)^+ - \tau\rho^{-1}(\phi\otimes\varphi^*)_{00} \\ \rho(a)\varphi \end{pmatrix},$$

with (b,φ) in $L^2_\ell(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_\ell(V^+)$. Our elliptic system (4.1) then takes the simple shape

$$\mathcal{D}_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi) + \{(a,\phi),(a,\phi)\} = (\zeta, w, s), \tag{4.2}$$

recalling from [29, Equation (2.39)] that $\mathcal{D}_{A,\Phi} = d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi} + d^1_{A,\Phi}$. This is the form of the (inhomogeneous) Coulomb gauge and PU(2) monopole equations we will use for the majority of the basic regularity arguments.

By analogy with [58], [62], we use $(a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)$, where $(v,\psi) \in L^2_{\ell-1}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_{\ell-1}(V^-)$, to rewrite the first-order quasi-linear equation (4.2) for (a,ϕ) in terms of (w,s),

$$d_A^+ d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) + \{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\} = (w,s), \tag{4.3}$$

to give a second-order, quasi-linear elliptic equation for (v,ψ) in terms of (w,s); the Coulomb-gauge equation reduces to $d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) = (\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\cdot)^*(v,\psi)$.

The precise dependence of the constants C below on the reference pair (A,Φ) in this section is not something we track carefully, as we are primarily interested in local L^2_k estimates of solutions (a,ϕ) to equations (4.2) or of solutions (v,ψ) to equations (4.3) when $k \geq 2$ or $k \geq 3$, respectively. For this range of the Sobolev indices, the constants no longer depend on simply $\|F_A\|_{L^2(X)}$ or $\|F_A^+\|_{L^\infty(X)}$, for example. Rather, they depend on higher-order covariant derivatives of the pair (A,Φ). In general, throughout this section, constants depending on (A,Φ) can be gauge-invariantly given as constants depending on $L^2_{k,A}$ norms of F_A or $L^2_{k+1,A}$ norms of Φ, following the method of [12, Lemma 2.3.11].

4.1. Regularity for L^2_1 solutions to the inhomogeneous Coulomb gauge and PU(2) monopole equations.

We recall in this subsection that an L^2_1 solution (a,ϕ) to the PU(2) monopole and Coulomb-gauge equations (4.2), with an L^2_k inhomogeneous term (with $k \geq 1$) is in L^2_{k+1}. Thus, if the inhomogeneous term is in C^∞ then (a,ϕ) is in C^∞.

Given any L^2_ℓ orthogonal connection A on $\mathfrak{g}_E$, fixed unitary connections on $\det E$, and fixed spin^c connection on W our Sobolev norms are defined in the usual way: for example, if $a \in C^\infty(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$, we write

$$\|a\|_{L^p_{k,A}(X)} := \left(\sum_{j=0}^k \|\nabla^j_A a\|^p_{L^p(X)}\right)^{1/p},$$

and if $(a,\phi) \in C^\infty(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus C^\infty(V^+)$, we write

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^p_{k,A}(X)} := \left(\|a\|^p_{L^p_{k,A}(X)} + \|\phi\|^p_{L^p_{k,A}(X)}\right)^{1/p},$$

for any $1 \le p \le \infty$ and integer $k \ge 0$ for which $L^2_\ell \subset L^p_k$ (see [2, Theorem 5.4]). Let $L^p_k(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$ be the completion of $C^\infty(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$ with respect to this norm, defining Sobolev norms and Banach-space completions of the other function spaces we shall need in the obvious way. Occasionally, it will be useful to consider different Sobolev exponents on one-forms and spinors when defining Banach spaces of pairs, such as

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^{p;p'}(X)} = \|a\|_{L^p(X)} + \|\phi\|_{L^{p'}(X)},$$

with other Sobolev norms defined in the analogous way.

Proposition 4.1. [29, Proposition 3.2] *Let X be a closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold with metric g, spin^c structure (ρ, W^+, W^-), and let E be a Hermitian two-plane bundle over X. Let (A,Φ) be a C^∞ pair on the bundles $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ over X and let $2 \le p < 4$. Then there are positive constants $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(A,\Phi,p)$ and $C = C(A,\Phi,p)$ with the following significance. Suppose that $(a,\phi) \in L^2_1(X, \Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_1(X, V^+)$ is an L^2_1 solution on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ to the elliptic system (4.2) over X, where (ζ, w, s) is in L^p. If $\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^4(X)} < \varepsilon$ then (a,ϕ) is in L^p_1 and*

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^p_{1,A}(X)} \le C\left(\|(\zeta,w,s)\|_{L^p(X)} + \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2(X)}\right).$$

Proposition 4.2. [29, Proposition 3.3] *Continue the notation of Proposition 4.1. Let $k \ge 1$ be an integer and let $2 < p < \infty$. Let (A,Φ) be a C^∞ pair on the bundles $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ over X. Suppose that $(a,\phi) \in L^p_1(X, \Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^p_1(X, V^+)$ is a solution on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ to the elliptic system (4.2) over X, where (ζ, w, s) is in L^2_k. Then (a,ϕ) is in L^2_{k+1} and there is a universal polynomial $Q_k(x,y)$, with positive real coefficients, depending at most on $(A,\Phi), k$, such that $Q_k(0,0) = 0$ and*

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{k+1,A}(X)} \le Q_k\left(\|(\zeta,w,s)\|_{L^2_{k,A}(X)}, \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^p_{1,A}(X)}\right).$$

In particular, if (ζ, w, s) is in C^∞ then (a,ϕ) is in C^∞ and if $(\zeta,w,s) = 0$, then

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{k+1,A}(X)} \le C\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^p_{1,A}(X)}.$$

By combining Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 we obtain the desired regularity result for L^2_1 solutions to the inhomogeneous Coulomb gauge and PU(2) monopole equations:

Corollary 4.3. [29, Corollary 3.4] *Continue the notation of Proposition 4.1. Let (A,Φ) be a C^∞ pair on the bundles $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ over X. Then there is a positive constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(A,\Phi)$ such that the following hold. Suppose that $(a,\phi) \in L^2_1(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_1(X,V^+)$ is a solution on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ to the elliptic system (4.2) over X, where (ζ,w,s) is in L^2_k and $\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^4(X)} < \varepsilon$ and $k\geq 0$ is an integer. Then (a,ϕ) is in L^2_{k+1} and there is a universal polynomial $Q_k(x,y)$, with positive real coefficients, depending at most on $(A,\Phi), k$, such that $Q_k(0,0)=0$ and*

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{k+1,A}(X)} \leq Q_k\left(\|(\zeta,w,s)\|_{L^2_{k,A}(X)}, \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2(X)}\right).$$

In particular, if (ζ,w,s) is in C^∞ then (a,ϕ) is in C^∞ and if $(\zeta,w,s)=0$, then

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{k+1,A}(X)} \leq C\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2(X)}.$$

4.2. Regularity for L^2_2 solutions to the inhomogeneous, second-order quasi-linear equation.

It remains to consider the regularity properties of the solution (v,ψ) to the second-order equation (4.3), where $(a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)$ and thus

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) = d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi).$$

The Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ is elliptic, with C^∞ coefficients, and thus standard regularity theory implies that if (a,ϕ) is in L^p_k then $d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)$ is in L^p_{k-1} and so (v,ψ) is in L^p_{k+1}.

In order to simultaneously treat regularity for solutions to the (extended) PU(2) monopole equations and their differentials, we consider the following generalization of the second-order system (4.3):

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) + \{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\} + \langle(\alpha,t), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\rangle = (w,s), \tag{4.4}$$

where $(v,\psi)\in L^2_2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_2(X,V^-)$, $(w,s)\in L^p_k(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^p_k(X,V^+)$, and $(\alpha,t)\in C^\infty(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus C^\infty(X,V^+)$. Here,

$$\langle\ ,\ \rangle : \Gamma(\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus\Gamma(V^+)\times\Gamma(\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus\Gamma(V^+)\to\Gamma(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus\Gamma(V^-),$$

denotes a bilinear map. Then the proofs of the regularity results of §4.1 adapt with essentially no change to give the following regularity results for equation (4.4).

Proposition 4.4. *Let X be a closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold with metric g, spin^c structure (ρ,W^+,W^-), and let E be a Hermitian two-plane bundle over X. Let (A,Φ) be a C^∞ pair on the bundles $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V^+)$ over X and let $2\leq p<4$. Suppose $(\alpha,t)\in C^\infty(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus C^\infty(X,V^+)$. Then there are positive constants $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(A,\Phi,\alpha,t,p)$ and $C=C(A,\Phi,\alpha,t,p)$ with the following significance. Suppose that $(v,\psi)\in L^2_2(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_2(X,V^-)$ is an L^2_2 solution to the elliptic system (4.4) over X, where (w,s) is in L^p. If $\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^4(X)}<\varepsilon$ then (v,ψ) is in L^p_2 and*

$$\|(v,\psi)\|_{L^p_{2,A}(X)} \leq C\left(\|(w,s)\|_{L^p(X)} + \|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2(X)}\right).$$

Proposition 4.5. *Continue the notation of Proposition 4.1. Let $k\geq 1$ be an integer and let $2<p<\infty$. Let (A,Φ) be a C^∞ pair on the bundles $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V^+)$ over X. Suppose $(\alpha,t)\in C^\infty(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus C^\infty(X,V^+)$. Suppose that $(v,\psi)\in L^p_1(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^p_1(X,V^+)$ is a solution to the elliptic system (4.4) over X, where (w,s) is in L^2_k. Then (v,ψ) is in*

L^2_{k+2} *and there is a universal polynomial* $Q_k(x,y)$*, with positive real coefficients, depending at most on* $(A,\Phi),(\alpha,t),k$*, such that* $Q_k(0,0)=0$ *and*

$$\|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2_{k+2,A}(X)} \leq Q_k\left(\|(w,s)\|_{L^2_{k,A}(X)}, \|(v,\psi)\|_{L^p_{2,A}(X)}\right).$$

In particular, if (w,s) *is in* C^∞ *then* (v,ψ) *is in* C^∞ *and if* $(w,s)=0$*, then*

$$\|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2_{k+2,A}(X)} \leq C\|(v,\psi)\|_{L^p_{2,A}(X)}.$$

By combining Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 we obtain the desired regularity result for L^2_2 solutions to the inhomogeneous, general second-order PU(2) monopole equations:

Corollary 4.6. *Continue the notation of Proposition 4.1. Let* (A,Φ) *be a* C^∞ *pair on the bundles* $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ *over* X*. Suppose* $(\alpha,t)\in C^\infty(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus C^\infty(X,V^+)$*. Then there is a positive constant* $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(A,\Phi,\alpha,t)$ *such that the following hold. Suppose that* $(v,\psi)\in L^2_1(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_1(X,V^+)$ *is a solution to the elliptic system* (4.4) *over* X*, where* (w,s) *is in* L^2_k *and* $\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^4(X)}<\varepsilon$ *and* $k\geq 0$ *is an integer. Then* (v,ψ) *is in* L^2_{k+2} *and there is a universal polynomial* $Q_k(x,y)$*, with positive real coefficients, depending at most on* $(A,\Phi),(\alpha,t),k$*, such that* $Q_k(0,0)=0$ *and*

$$\|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2_{k+2,A}(X)} \leq Q_k\left(\|(w,s)\|_{L^2_{k,A}(X)}, \|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2(X)}\right).$$

In particular, if (w,s) *is in* C^∞ *then* (v,ψ) *is in* C^∞ *and if* $(w,s)=0$*, then*

$$\|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2_{k+2,A}(X)} \leq C\|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2(X)}.$$

4.3. Local regularity and interior estimates for L^2_1 solutions to the inhomogeneous Coulomb gauge and PU(2) monopole equations.

In this section we specialize the results of §4.1 to the case where the reference pair is a trivial PU(2) monopole, so $(A,\Phi)=(\Gamma,0)$ on the bundles $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V^+)$, over an open subset $\Omega\subset X$, where Γ is a flat connection.

We continue to assume that X is a closed, oriented four-manifold with metric g, spin^c bundle W, and Hermitian two-plane bundle E extending those on $\Omega\subset X$. We use these inhomogeneous estimates and regularity results to show that a global L^2_1 gluing solution (a,ϕ) to the extended $PU(2)$ monopole equations is actually C^∞.

We have the following local versions of Propositions 4.1 and 4.2 and Corollary 4.3:

Proposition 4.7. [29, Proposition 3.9] *Continue the notation of the preceding paragraph. Let* $\Omega'\Subset\Omega$ *be a precompact open subset and let* $2\leq p<4$*. Then there are positive constants* $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\Omega,p)$ *and* $C=C(\Omega',\Omega,p)$ *with the following significance. Suppose that* (a,ϕ) *is an* $L^2_1(\Omega)$ *solution to the elliptic system* (4.2) *over* Ω*, with* $(A,\Phi)=(\Gamma,0)$ *and where* (ζ,w,s) *is in* $L^p(\Omega)$*. If* $\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^4(\Omega)}<\varepsilon$ *then* (a,ϕ) *is in* $L^p_1(\Omega')$ *and*

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^p_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega')} \leq C\left(\|(\zeta,w,s)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right).$$

Proposition 4.8. [29, Proposition 3.10] *Continue the notation of Proposition 4.7. Let* $k\geq 1$ *be an integer, and let* $2<p<\infty$*. Suppose that* (a,ϕ) *is an* $L^p_1(\Omega)$ *solution to the elliptic system* (4.2) *over* Ω *with* $(A,\Phi)=(\Gamma,0)$*, where* (ζ,w,s) *is in* $L^2_k(\Omega)$*. Then* (a,ϕ)

is in $L^2_{k+1}(\Omega')$ *and there is a universal polynomial* $Q_k(x,y)$*, with positive real coefficients, depending at most on* k*,* Ω'*,* Ω*, such that* $Q_k(0,0)=0$ *and*

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{k+1,\Gamma}(\Omega')} \leq Q_k\left(\|(\zeta,w,s)\|_{L^2_{k,\Gamma}(\Omega)}, \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^p_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega)}\right).$$

If (ζ,w,s) *is in* $C^\infty(\Omega)$ *then* (a,ϕ) *is in* $C^\infty(\Omega')$ *and if* $(\zeta,w,s)=0$*, then*

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{k+1,\Gamma}(\Omega')} \leq C\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^p_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega)}.$$

Corollary 4.9. [29, Corollary 3.11] *Continue the notation of Proposition 4.8. Then there is a positive constant* $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\Omega)$ *with the following significance. Suppose that* (a,ϕ) *is an* $L^2_1(\Omega)$ *solution to the elliptic system* (4.2) *over* Ω *with* $(A,\Phi)=(\Gamma,0)$*, where* (ζ,w,s) *is in* $L^2_k(\Omega)$ *and* $\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^4(\Omega)}<\varepsilon$*. Then* (a,ϕ) *is in* $L^2_{k+1}(\Omega')$ *and there is a universal polynomial* $Q_k(x,y)$*, with positive real coefficients, depending at most on* k*,* Ω'*,* Ω*, such that* $Q_k(0,0)=0$ *and*

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{k+1,\Gamma}(\Omega')} \leq Q_k\left(\|(\zeta,w,s)\|_{L^2_{k,\Gamma}(\Omega)}, \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right).$$

If (ζ,w,s) *is in* $C^\infty(\Omega)$ *then* (a,ϕ) *is in* $C^\infty(\Omega')$ *and if* $(\zeta,w,s)=0$*, then*

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{k+1,\Gamma}(\Omega')} \leq C\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Corollary 4.9 thus yields a sharp local elliptic regularity result for PU(2) monopoles (A,Φ) in L^2_1 which are given to us in Coulomb gauge relative to $(\Gamma,0)$.

Proposition 4.10. [29, Proposition 3.12] *Continue the notation of Corollary 4.9. Then there is a positive constant* $\varepsilon=\varepsilon(\Omega)$ *and, if* $k\geq 1$ *is an integer, there is a positive constant* $C=C(\Omega',\Omega,k)$ *with the following significance. Suppose that* (A,Φ) *is an* L^2_1 *solution to the* PU(2) *monopole equations* (2.1) *over* Ω*, which is in Coulomb gauge over* Ω *relative to* $(\Gamma,0)$*, so* $d^*_\Gamma(A-\Gamma)=0$*, and obeys* $\|(A-\Gamma,\Phi)\|_{L^4(\Omega)}<\varepsilon$*. Then* $(A-\Gamma,\Phi)$ *is in* $C^\infty(\Omega')$ *and for any* $k\geq 1$*,*

$$\|(A-\Gamma,\Phi)\|_{L^2_{k,\Gamma}(\Omega')} \leq C\|(A-\Gamma,\Phi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

4.4. **Estimates for PU(2) monopoles in a good local gauge.** It remains to combine the local regularity results and estimates of §4.3, for PU(2) monopoles (A,Φ) where the connection A is assumed to be in Coulomb gauge relative to the product SO(3) connection Γ, with Uhlenbeck's local, Coulomb gauge-fixing theorem. We then obtain regularity results and estimates for PU(2) monopoles (A,Φ) with small curvature F_A, parallel to those of Theorem 2.3.8 and Proposition 4.4.10 in [12] for anti-self-dual connections.

In order to apply Corollary 4.9 we need Uhlenbeck's Coulomb gauge-fixing result [67, Theorem 2.1 & Corollary 2.2]). Let B (respectively, $\bar{B}$) be the open (respectively, closed) unit ball centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^4$ and let G be a compact Lie group. In order to provide universal constants we assume $\mathbb{R}^4$ has its standard metric, though the results of this subsection naturally hold for any C^∞ Riemannian metric, with comparable constants for metrics which are suitably close.

Theorem 4.11. *There are positive constants* c *and* ε *with the following significance. If* $2\leq p<4$ *is a constant and* $A\in L^p_1(B,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g})\cap L^p_1(\partial B,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g})$ *is a connection matrix whose* *curvature satisfies* $\|F_A\|_{L^p(B)} < \varepsilon$, *then there is a gauge transformation* $u \in L^p_2(B,G) \cap L^p_2(\partial B, G)$ *such that* $u(A) := uAu^{-1} - (du)u^{-1}$ *satisfies*

$$d^*u(A) = 0 \text{ on } B, \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \lrcorner u(A) = 0 \text{ on } \partial B, \tag{2}$$

$$\|u(A)\|_{L^p_1(B)} \leq c\|F_A\|_{L^p(B)}. \tag{3}$$

If A *is in* $L^p_k(B)$, *for* $k \geq 2$, *then* u *is in* $L^p_{k+1}(B)$. *The gauge transformation* u *is unique up to multiplication by a constant element of* G.

Remark 4.12. If G is Abelian then the requirement that $\|F_A\|_{L^p(B)} < \varepsilon$ can be omitted.

It is often useful to rephrase Theorem 4.11 in two other slightly different ways. Suppose A is an L^2_k connection on a C^∞ principal G bundle P over B with $k \geq 2$ and $\|F_A\|_{L^2(B)} < \varepsilon$. Then the assertions of Theorem 4.11 are equivalent to each of the following:

- There is an L^2_{k+1} trivialization $\tau : P \to B \times G$ such that (i) $d^*_\Gamma(\tau(A) - \Gamma) = 0$, where Γ is the product connection on $B \times G$, (ii) $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \lrcorner (\tau(A) - \Gamma) = 0$, and (iii) $\|(\tau(A) - \Gamma)\|_{L^2_1(B)} \leq c\|F_A\|_{L^2(B)}$.
- There is an L^2_{k+1} flat connection Γ on P such that (i) $d^*_\Gamma(A - \Gamma) = 0$, (ii) $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \lrcorner (A - \Gamma) = 0$, and (iii) $\|(A - \Gamma)\|_{L^2_1(B)} \leq c\|F_A\|_{L^2(B)}$, and an L^2_{k+1} trivialization $P|_B \simeq B \times G$ taking Γ to the product connection.

We can now combine Theorem 4.11 with Proposition 4.10 to give the following analogue of Theorem 2.3.8 in [12] — the interior estimate for anti-self-dual connections with L^2-small curvature.

Corollary 4.13. *Let* $B \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ *be the open unit ball with center at the origin with spin*^{c} *structure* (ρ, W^+, W^-), *let* $U \Subset B$ *be an open subset, and let* Γ *be the product connection on* $B \times \mathrm{SO}(3)$. *Then there is a positive constant* ε *and if* $\ell \geq 1$ *is an integer, there is a positive constant* $C(\ell, U)$ *with the following significance. Suppose that* (A, Φ) *is an* L^2_1 *solution to the* PU(2) *monopole equations* (2.1) *over* B *and that the curvature of the* SO(3) *connection matrix* A *obeys* $\|F_A\|_{L^2(B)} < \varepsilon$. *Then there is an* L^2_{k+1} *gauge transformation* $u : B \to \mathrm{SU}(2)$ *such that* $(u(A) - \Gamma, u\Phi)$ *is in* $C^\infty(B)$ *with* $d^*(u(A) - \Gamma) = 0$ *over* B *and*

$$\|(u(A) - \Gamma, u\Phi)\|_{L^2_{\ell,\Gamma}(U)} \leq C\|F_A\|^{1/2}_{L^2(B)}.$$

Again, it is often useful to rephrase Corollary 4.13 in the two other slightly different ways. Suppose $\ell \geq 1$ and that (A, Φ) is a PU(2) monopole in L^2_k on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ over the unit ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ with $k \geq \max\{2, \ell\}$, $\|F_A\|_{L^2(B)} < \varepsilon$ and $U \Subset B$. Then the assertions of Corollary 4.13 are equivalent to each of the following:

- There is a C^∞ trivialization $\tau : E|_B \to B \times \mathbb{C}^2$ and a L^2_{k+1} determinant-one, unitary bundle automorphism u of $E|_B$ such that, with respect to the product connection Γ on $B \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$, we have (i) $d^*_\Gamma(\tau u(A) - \Gamma) = 0$, and (ii) $\|(\tau u(A) - \Gamma, \tau u\Phi)\|_{L^2_{\ell,\Gamma}(U)} \leq C\|F_A\|^{1/2}_{L^2(B)}$.

- There is an L^2_{k+1} flat connection Γ on $\mathfrak{g}_E|_B$ such that (i) $d^*_\Gamma(A-\Gamma)=0$, and (ii) $\|(A-\Gamma,\Phi)\|_{L^2_{\ell,\Gamma}(U)} \le c\|F_A\|^{1/2}_{L^2(B)}$, and an L^2_{k+1} trivialization $\mathfrak{g}_E|_B \simeq B\times\mathfrak{su}(2)$ taking Γ to the product connection.

We will also need interior estimates for PU(2) monopoles in a good local gauge over more general simply-connected regions than the open balls considered in Corollary 4.13. Specifically, recall that a domain $\Omega\subset X$ is *strongly simply-connected* if it has an open covering by balls $D_1,\dots,D_m$ (not necessarily geodesic) such that for $1\le r\le m$ the intersection $D_r\cap(D_1\cup\cdots\cup D_{r-1})$ is connected. We recall (see [12, Proposition 2.2.3] or [40, Proposition I.2.6]):

Proposition 4.14. *If Γ is a C^∞ flat connection on a principal G bundle P over a simply-connected manifold Ω, then there is a C^∞ isomorphism $P\simeq\Omega\times G$ taking Γ to the product connection on $\Omega\times G$.*

More generally, if A is C^∞ connection on a G bundle P over a simply-connected manifold-with-boundary $\bar\Omega=\Omega\cup\partial\Omega$ with L^p-small curvature (with $p>2$), then Uhlenbeck's theorem implies that A is L^p_2-gauge equivalent to a connection which is L^p_1-close to an L^p_1 flat connection on P (see [69, Corollary 4.3] or [12, p. 163]). The following *a priori* interior estimate is a straightforward generalization of [12, Proposition 4.4.10].

Proposition 4.15. *Let X be a closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold with spin^c structure (ρ,W^+,W^-) and let $\Omega\subset X$ be a strongly simply-connected open subset. Then there is a positive constant $\varepsilon(\Omega)$ with the following significance. For $\Omega'\Subset\Omega$ a precompact open subset and an integer $\ell\ge1$, there is a constant $C(\ell,\Omega',\Omega)$ such that the following holds. Suppose (A,Φ) is a $\mathrm{PU}(2)$ monopole in L^2_k on $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V^+)$ over Ω with $k\ge\max\{2,\ell\}$ such that*

$$\|F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}<\varepsilon.$$

Then there is an L^2_{k+1} flat connection Γ on $\mathfrak{g}_E|_{\Omega'}$ such that

$$\|(A-\Gamma,\Phi)\|_{L^2_{\ell,\Gamma}(\Omega')}\le C\|F_A\|^{1/2}_{L^2(\Omega)},$$

and an L^2_{k+1} trivialization $\mathfrak{g}_E|_{\Omega'}\simeq\Omega'\times\mathfrak{su}(2)$ taking Γ to the product connection.

4.5. **Regularity of gluing solutions to the extended PU(2) monopole equations.**

Finally, we come to one of the main results of this section.

Proposition 4.16. *Let X be a closed, oriented, C^∞ four-manifold with C^∞ Riemannian metric g, spin^c structure (ρ,W^+,W^-), and let E be a Hermitian, rank-two bundle over X. Let (A,Φ) be a C^∞ pair on the bundles $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V^+)$ over X. Suppose that $(a,\phi)\in L^2_1(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_1(X,V^+)$ is a solution to an extended $\mathrm{PU}(2)$ monopole equation over X,*

$$\mathfrak{S}(A+a,\Phi+\phi)=(w,s),$$

where $(a,\phi)=d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)$, for some $(v,\psi)\in(C^0\cap L^2_2)(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus(C^0\cap L^2_2)(X,V^-)$, and $(w,s)\in C^\infty(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus C^\infty(X,V^-)$. Then (a,ϕ) is in $C^\infty(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus C^\infty(X,V^+)$ and $(v,\psi)\in C^\infty(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus C^\infty(X,V^+)$.

Remark 4.17. It is important to note that the hypotheses of Proposition 4.16 are strictly weaker than those of Corollary 4.3 because we not assume that (a, ϕ) is L^4 small relative to some constant $\varepsilon(A, \Phi)$ which depends, in a possibly unfavorable way, on the pair (A, Φ).

Otherwise, the reader may wonder why we could not simply apply Corollary 4.3 to the elliptic system (4.5) and deduce straightaway that the solution (a, ϕ) is in C^∞. The difficulty, of course, is that the hypotheses of Corollary 4.3 are not necessarily satisfied due to the possibly unfavorable dependence of the constant $\varepsilon(A, \Phi)$ on the pair (A, Φ). For example, by combining results of §5 and §9, we can show that $\|(a, \phi)\|_{L^4(X)} \leq C\lambda$ when $(A_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda)$ is a spliced pair (produced by the algorithm of §3), λ is a parameter which can be made arbitrarily small, and C is an essentially universal constant, depending at most on $\|F^+_{A_\lambda}\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)}$, $\|F_{A_\lambda}\|_{L^2}$, and $\|\Phi_\lambda\|_{L^2_{2,A_\lambda}(X)}$: in particular, C is independent of λ. Now, as we make λ smaller to try to satisfy the constraint of Corollary 4.3, we will in general find that $\varepsilon(A_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda)$ also becomes smaller (as it will, for example, if $\varepsilon(A_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda)$ depends on an L^p_k norm of F_{A_λ} with $p > 2$, $k = 0$ or $k \geq 1$, $p = 2$). Thus, as we do not necessarily have a lower bound for $\varepsilon(A, \Phi)$ which is uniform with respect to (A, Φ), we are left "chasing our tail" and Corollary 4.3 will not apply.

Proof of Proposition 4.16. Since $a = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v, \psi)$, the extended PU(2) monopole and Coulomb-gauge equations become

$$\begin{aligned} d^1_{A,\Phi}(a, \phi) + \{(a, \phi), (a, \phi)\} &= (w, s) - \mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi), \\ d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi}(a, \phi) &= (\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\cdot)^*(v, \psi), \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi) \in C^\infty(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus C^\infty(V^-)$ and $(\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\cdot)^*(v, \psi) \in (C^0 \cap L^2_2)(\mathfrak{g}_E)$. Observe that

$$(\zeta, w', s') := ((\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\cdot)^*(v, \psi), (w, s) - \mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)) \in L^2_2(\mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_2(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_2(V^-).$$

From Remark 4.17 we note that we *cannot* take the apparently obvious route and apply Corollary 4.3. Instead, we fix a point $x \in X$ and a geodesic ball $B(x, \delta)$ centered at x, fix a C^∞ trivialization $\mathfrak{g}_E|_{B(x,\delta)} \simeq B(x, \delta) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$, and let Γ be the resulting product connection. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d^1_{\Gamma,0}(b, \varphi) + \{(b, \varphi), (b, \varphi)\} &= (w, s) - \mathfrak{S}(\Gamma, 0) = (w, s), \\ d^{0,*}_{\Gamma,0}(b, \varphi) &= (\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\cdot)^*(v, \psi) \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where $b := A - \Gamma + a \in L^2_1(B(x, \delta), \Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$, $\varphi := \Phi + \phi \in L^2_1(B(x, \delta), V^+)$, and the first equation is the expansion of $\mathfrak{S}(\Gamma + b, 0 + \Phi + \phi) = (w, s)$. In particular, the right-hand side of equation (4.6) is in $L^2_1(B(x, \delta))$.

In Corollary 4.9, let $\Omega = B \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ be the unit ball, let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\Omega)$ be the corresponding positive constant, and let $\Omega' = B'$ be a slightly smaller concentric ball. Since $(a, \phi) \in L^4(X, \Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$, we know that $\|(a, \phi)\|_{L^4(U)} \to 0$ as $\mathrm{Vol}(U) \to 0$, where U is any measurable subset of X. In particular, for a small enough ball $B(x, \delta)$, we have $\|(b, \varphi)\|_{L^4(B(x,\delta))} < \varepsilon$. We now rescale the metric g on the ball $B(x, \delta)$ to give a ball $\tilde{B}$ with unit radius, center x, and metric which is approximately flat. Note that the equations (4.6) are scale-equivariant (see [29, §4.2]), when φ is replaced by $\tilde{\varphi} = \delta\varphi$ and the metric g on TX by $\tilde{g} = \delta^{-2}g$, and that

$$\|(b, \tilde{\varphi})\|_{L^4(\tilde{B},\tilde{g})} = \|(b, \varphi)\|_{L^4(B(x,\delta),g)} < \varepsilon,$$

by the scale-invariance of the L^4 norm on one-forms and rescaled spinors. (Bear in mind that we write "g" in [29, §4.2] for the metric g^* on T^*X and so our rescaling rule for monopoles agrees with [65, §4.1] and [56, §8.1], with $\tilde{g}^* = \delta^2 g^*$.) Corollary 4.9 now implies that $(b, \tilde{\varphi})$ — and thus $(a, \tilde{\phi})$ — is in L^2_2 on the slightly smaller concentric rescaled ball $\tilde{B}' \Subset \tilde{B}$. Therefore, (a, ϕ) is in L^2_2 on the slightly smaller ball $B' \Subset B$. Since $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v, \psi) = d^1_{A,\Phi}(a, \phi)$ is now in $L^2_1(B')$, we have $(v, \psi) \in L^2_3(B'')$ by standard elliptic regularity theory for a Laplacian, $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$, with C^∞ coefficients [39], where $B'' \Subset B'$ is again a slightly smaller concentric ball. Hence, the right-hand side of equation (4.6) is in $L^2_2(B'')$. Repeating the above argument shows that (a, ϕ) is in C^∞ on $B(x, \delta/2)$ and so, as the point $x \in X$ was arbitrary, we see that both (a, ϕ) and (v, ψ) are C^∞ over all of X. □

5. ESTIMATES FOR APPROXIMATE PU(2) MONOPOLES

The main purpose of this section is to derive an $L^{\sharp,2;2}$ estimate (see Proposition 5.5) for $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$, when (A, Φ) is a pair — an approximate solution to the extended PU(2) monopole equations — produced by the splicing construction of §3.

5.1. **Technical preliminaries.** In this subsection we gather a few of the technical estimates we shall need for the proof of Proposition 5.5 and, moreover, when we derive estimates for eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ in §8.

The pointwise bounds we require are due to J. Råde [55] in the case of a Yang-Mills connection defined on an annulus in $\mathbb{R}^4$ with its Euclidean metric and to D. Groisser and T. Parker in the case of an annulus in a four-manifold X with an arbitrary Riemannian metric of bounded geometry. Recall that A is a *Yang-Mills* connection if $d^*_A F_A = 0$ (and $d_A F_A = 0$) and that if A is anti-self-dual then it satisfies the Yang-Mills equations.

Theorem 5.1. [12], [38], [55] *Let X be a closed, oriented, four-manifold with metric g and let G be a compact Lie group. Then there exist positive constants c, ε with the following significance. If A is a Yang-Mills connection on a G bundle P over an annulus $\Omega(x_0; r_0, r_1)$ in X with $0 < 4r_0 < r_1$ and whose curvature F_A satisfies*

$$\|F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega(x_0;r_0,r_1))} \le \varepsilon,$$

and $r = \operatorname{dist}_g(x, x_0)$, then

$$|F_A|(x) \le c\left(\frac{r_0^2}{r^4} + \frac{1}{r_1^2}\right) \|F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega(x_0;r_0,r_1))}, \qquad 2r_0 \le r \le r_1/2.$$

A similar estimate, for anti-self-dual connections and flat metrics, was proved by Donaldson using certain differential inequalities arising from the Chern-Simons function [9, Appendix], [12, Proposition 7.3.3].

Though not mentioned explicitly in [12], [55], the proof of Theorem 5.1 extends to give the following more general decay estimate:

Corollary 5.2. *Continue the hypotheses of Theorem 5.1. Then for any integer $k \ge 0$ we have*

$$|\nabla^k_A F_A|(x) \le \frac{c_k}{r^k}\left(\frac{r_0^2}{r^4} + \frac{1}{r_1^2}\right) \|F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega(x_0;r_0,r_1))}, \qquad 2r_0 \le r \le r_1/2. \tag{5.1}$$

For example, the corollary follows immediately by combining Råde's Lemma 2.2 and Theorem $1'$ (the version of his Theorem 1 for a cylinder $(t_0,t_1)\times S^3$ in place of the annulus $\Omega(r_0,r_1)$).

We shall also need to establish the existence of a universal estimate for the $L^{\sharp,2}$ norm of the curvature of a g-anti-self-dual connection.

Lemma 5.3. [20, Lemma 5.9] *Let (X,g) be a C^∞, closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold and let $\kappa\geq 0$ be an integer. Then there is a constant $c=c(X,g,\kappa)$ such that $\|F_A\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X,g)}\leq c$ for all $[A]\in M^w_\kappa(X,g)$.*

For any $N>1$ and $\lambda>0$, Lemma 7.2.10 in [12] provides a clever construction of a cut-off function β on $\mathbb{R}^4$ such that $\beta(x)=0$ for $|x|\leq N^{-1}\sqrt{\lambda}$, $\beta(x)=1$ for $|x|\geq N\sqrt{\lambda}$, and satisfying the crucial estimate

$$\|\nabla\beta\|_{L^4}\leq c(\log N)^{-3/4},$$

where c is a constant independent of N and λ. We will need the following refinement of this result; for the definition and properties of the $L^\sharp$ and related families of Sobolev norms, see [16, §4].

Lemma 5.4. [20, Lemma 5.8] *There is a positive constant c such that the following holds. For any $N>4$ and $\lambda>0$, there is a C^∞ cut-off function $\beta=\beta_{N,\lambda}$ on $\mathbb{R}^4$ such that*

$$\beta(x)=\begin{cases}1 & \text{if } |x|\geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda},\\ 0 & \text{if } |x|\leq N^{-1}\sqrt{\lambda},\end{cases}$$

and satisfying the following estimates:

$$\|\nabla\beta\|_{L^4}\leq c(\log N)^{-3/4}, \tag{1}$$

$$\|\nabla^2\beta\|_{L^2}\leq c(\log N)^{-1/2}, \tag{2}$$

$$\|\nabla\beta\|_{L^{2\sharp}}\leq c(\log N)^{-1/2}, \tag{3}$$

$$\|\nabla\beta\|_{L^2}\leq c(\log N)^{-1}\sqrt{\lambda}, \tag{4}$$

$$\|\nabla^2\beta\|_{L^{4/3}}\leq c(\log N)^{-1}\sqrt{\lambda}. \tag{5}$$

5.2. **Estimates of $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$ for spliced pairs.** An important application of the decay estimates for anti-self-dual connections in Theorem 5.1 is to bound $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$ when (A,Φ) is an approximate solution to the extended PU(2) monopole equations produced by the splicing construction of §3. As we shall discover in §9, a key measure of the size of $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$ in $\Gamma(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus\Gamma(V^+)$ is given by

$$\|(v,\psi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X)}=\|v\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)}+\|\psi\|_{L^2(X)}, \tag{5.2}$$

where $\|v\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)}=\|v\|_{L^\sharp(X)}+\|v\|_{L^2(X)}$ and the $L^\sharp$ family of Sobolev norms is defined in [16], following Taubes' development in [59], [62], [63].

Proposition 5.5. *Let (A,Φ) be a spliced pair on the bundles $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V^+)$ over (X,g), produced by the splicing construction of §3 (see definitions (3.19) and (3.24)), where the background family $\mathcal{U}\Subset\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)$ of pairs is a relatively open, precompact submanifold. Then, there are* *constants and* $c = c(g)$, $C = C(\mathcal{U}, \kappa, g)$, $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(\mathcal{U}, \kappa, g)$, *such that for all* $\lambda < \lambda_0$, *where* $\lambda := \max_{1\le i\le m} \lambda_i$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X,g)} &\le C\lambda^{1/6} + \|\mathfrak{S}(A_0,\Phi_0)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X,g)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \|F^{+,g}(A_i)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(B(x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4))}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where $\lambda_i = \lambda[A_i]$. *If* $F^{+,\delta}_{A_i} = 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^4$ *for all* i *then*

$$\|\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X,g)} \le C\lambda^{1/6} + \|\mathfrak{S}(A_0,\Phi_0)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X,g)}. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. Let ε be a positive constant which is less than or equal to that of the decay estimate in Theorem 5.1 for the curvature of a Yang-Mills connection. Chose a constant $0 < \varrho = L^{-1} \le 1$ small enough that $\varrho\sqrt{8\pi^2\kappa_i} < \varepsilon$, for all $i \ge 1$. Choose λ_0 small enough that $\sqrt{\lambda_0} \le \varrho/16$.

For the sake of exposition we shall assume without loss in the proof that the connections A_i are δ-anti-self-dual, even though this is not required by our splicing construction or the hypotheses of Proposition 5.5. Indeed, for our application in [27] the moduli spaces of mass-centered instantons on S^4 will be replaced by diffeomorphic moduli spaces of spliced, almost-mass-centered, approximate instantons. However, the changes required to accommodate the more general situation needed in [27] are elementary.

The Chebychev inequality (see Lemma 3.2) implies that

$$\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4 - B(0,\lambda_i/\varrho),\delta)} \le \varrho\sqrt{8\pi^2\kappa_i} < \varepsilon,$$

since $\varrho\sqrt{8\pi^2\kappa_i} < \varepsilon$, by definition of ϱ, and as (Definition 3.1)

$$\lambda[A_i]^2 = \frac{1}{8\pi^2\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{R}^4} |x|^2 |F_{A_i}|^2_\delta \, d^4x = \lambda_i^2.$$

Hence, provided $\lambda < \lambda_0$, the δ-anti-self-dual connections A_i over S^4 obey the hypotheses of Theorem 5.1 when $r_0 = \lambda_i/\varrho$ for small enough ϱ and $r_1 = \infty$.

Recall from definitions (3.19) and (3.24) that

$$(A,\Phi) := \begin{cases} (A_0, \Phi_0) & \text{on } X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}), \\ (A_0, \chi_{x_i, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}}\Phi_0) & \text{on } \Omega(x_i; 4\lambda_i^{1/3}, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}), \\ (\Gamma + \chi_{x_i, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}}\sigma_i^* A_0, 0) & \text{on } \Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}), \\ (\Gamma, 0) & \text{on } \Omega(x_i; \sqrt{\lambda_i}/2, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}), \\ (\Gamma + (1 - \chi_{x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2})(\varphi_n \circ \varphi_i^{-1})^* \tau_i^* A_i, 0) & \text{on } \Omega(x_i; \sqrt{\lambda_i}/4, \sqrt{\lambda_i}/2), \\ ((\varphi_n \circ \varphi_i^{-1})^* A_i, 0) & \text{on } B(x_i, \sqrt{\lambda_i}/4), \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

where the cut-off functions are defined in equation (3.17). Over the region $X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 8\lambda_i^{1/3})$ we have $(A,\Phi) = (A_0,\Phi_0)$, while over the annuli $\Omega(x_i; \sqrt{\lambda_i}/2, 2\sqrt{\lambda_i})$ we have $F_A = 0$, and over the balls $B(x_i, \sqrt{\lambda_i}/4)$ we have $F_A = F_{A_i}$. Thus, it remains to consider the three annuli where cutting off occurs and the balls $B(x_i, \sqrt{\lambda_i}/4)$.

Over the region $X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 8\lambda_i^{1/3})$ the definition (5.5) of (A,Φ) gives $(A,\Phi) = (A_0,\Phi_0)$ and so $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi) = \mathfrak{S}(A_0,\Phi_0)$. Our hypothesis on the precompact family $\mathcal{U}$ of background pairs $[A_0, \Phi_0]$ is that $\|\mathfrak{S}(A_0, \Phi_0)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X)}$ is small:

$$\|\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}))} \leq \|\mathfrak{S}(A_0, \Phi_0)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X)}. \tag{5.6}$$

Over the outer annulus $\Omega(x_i; 4\lambda_i^{1/3}, 8\lambda_i^{1/3})$ the definition (5.5) of (A, Φ) gives $(A, \Phi) = (A_0, \chi_i \Phi_0)$ where we temporarily use the abbreviation $\chi_i = \chi_{x_i, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}}$. Our expression (2.1) for $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$ then yields

$$\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi) = \begin{pmatrix} F_{A_0}^+ - \tau\rho^{-1}(\chi_i\Phi_0 \otimes \chi_i\Phi_0^*)_{00}, \\ \chi_i D_{A_0}\Phi_0 + \rho(\vartheta + d\chi_i)\Phi_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Given $2 < p \leq \infty$, choose $4 < q \leq \infty$ for the remainder of the proof by setting $1/p = 1/4 + 1/q$. Since $[A_0, \Phi_0]$ varies in a precompact family, using the L^4 estimate for $d\chi_i$ in Lemma 5.4 and the preceding expression for $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(\Omega(x_i; 4\lambda_i^{1/3}, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}))} \\ &\leq c\|\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\|_{L^p(\Omega(x_i; 4\lambda_i^{1/3}, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}))} \quad \text{(by [16, Lemma 4.1], for } 2 < p \leq \infty) \\ &\leq C\left(\lambda_i^{4/(3p)} + \|d\chi_i\|_{L^4}\|\Phi_0\|_{L^q(\Omega(x_i; 4\lambda_i^{1/3}, 8\lambda_i^{1/3}))}\right) \\ &\leq C(\lambda_i^{4/(3p)} + \lambda_i^{4/(3q)}) \leq C\lambda_i^{4/(3p) - 1/3}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

This concludes the estimate for $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$ over the outer annulus.

Over the middle annulus $\Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i})$ we see that (5.5) yields

$$F_A = \chi_i F_{A_0} + d\chi_i \wedge \sigma_i^* A_0 + (\chi_i^2 - \chi_i)\sigma_i^* A_0 \wedge \sigma_i^* A_0, \tag{5.8}$$

where we set $\chi_i = \chi_{x_i, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}}$ for convenience. Since the connection one-form $\sigma_i^* A_0$ is in radial gauge with respect to the point $x_i \in X$, we have $|\varphi_i^* \sigma_i^* A_0|(x) \leq C|x|$, where $C = \|F_{A_0}\|_{L^\infty(B(x_i, \varrho/2))}$, and thus for any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma_i^* A_0\|_{L^p(B(x_i, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}))} &\leq c\lambda_i^{2/p}\|\sigma_i^* A_0\|_{L^\infty(B(x_i, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}))} \\ &\leq C\lambda_i^{(2/p) + 1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

From the expression (5.8) for F_A over the annulus $\Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i})$ — where $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi) = (F_A^{+,g}, 0)$ — and the L^p estimates (5.9) for $\sigma_i^* A_0$ and that of Lemma 5.4 for $d\chi_i$, we obtain an estimate for $F_A^{+,g}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(\Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}))} \\ &= \|F_A^{+,g}\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(\Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}))} \\ &\leq c\|F_A^{+,g}\|_{L^p(\Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}))} \quad \text{(by [16, Lemma 4.1], for } 2 < p \leq \infty) \\ &\leq c\Big(\|F_{A_0}^{+,g}\|_{L^p(B(x_i, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}))} + \|d\chi_i\|_{L^4}\|\sigma_i^* A_0\|_{L^q(\Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}))} \\ &\qquad + \|\sigma_i^* A_0\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i}))}^2\Big) \\ &\leq C\left(\lambda_i^{2/p} + \lambda_i^{(2/q) + 1/2} + \lambda_i^{2(p + 1/2)}\right) \leq C\lambda_i^{2/p}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

This completes the required estimates for $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$ over the annulus $\Omega(x_i; 2\sqrt{\lambda_i}, 4\sqrt{\lambda_i})$.

Next we turn to the estimate of $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi) = (F_A^{+,g}, 0)$ over the inner annulus $\Omega(x_i;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2)$. The hypotheses imply that $F_{A_i}^{+,\delta} = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^4$, where δ is the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^4$. Since the metric g is approximately Euclidean in normal coordinates, $\varphi_i^*g \approx \delta$, we shall assume $\varphi_i^*g = \delta$ without loss and regard the annulus $\Omega(x_i;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2) \subset X$ as identified isometrically with the annulus $\Omega(0;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$, even though we shall *not* assume $F_{A_i}^{+,g} \equiv 0$. This time, our expression (5.5) for the connection A yields

$$F_A = \chi_i F(\tau_i^*A_i) + d\chi_i \wedge \tau_i^*A_i + (\chi_i^2 - \chi_i)\tau_i^*A_i \wedge \tau_i^*A_i, \tag{5.11}$$

where we now abbreviate $\chi_i = 1 - \chi_{x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2}$ and $\tau_i^*A_i = (\varphi_n \circ \varphi_i^{-1})^*\tau_i^*A_i$.

Recall from [58, Equation (7.12)] or [68] that, as $\tau_i^*A_i$ is in radial gauge with respect to the south pole of S^4, then the local connection one-form $\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i$ obeys [33, p. 146] $(\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i)_r \equiv \partial_r \lrcorner \varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i = 0$ and $\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i(\infty,\theta) = 0$, where $r = |x| = \varphi_n^{-1}(\cdot)$, so

$$(\varphi_n^*F_{A_i})_{r\theta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial r}(\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i)_\theta,$$

where $(\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i)_\theta = \partial_\theta \lrcorner \varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i$ and thus

$$\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i(r,\theta) = -\int_r^\infty (\varphi_n^*F_{A_i})_{t\theta}\,dt.$$

Hence, Theorem 5.1 (with $r_1 = \infty$) yields a bound for $|F_{A_i}|_\delta$ and $|\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i|_\delta$ on $\Omega(0;2r_0,\infty) = \mathbb{R}^4 - B(2r_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_n^*F_{A_i}|_\delta(x) &\le c\frac{r_0^2}{r^4}\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^2(\Omega(0;r_0,\infty),\delta)}, \\ |\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i|_\delta(x) &\le c\frac{r_0^2}{r^3}\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^2(\Omega(0;r_0,\infty),\delta)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

and therefore, on the annulus $\Omega(0;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2)$, we have — setting $r_0 = L\lambda_i$ and using $\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^2(\Omega(0;r_0,\infty),\delta)} < \varepsilon \ll 1$ when $L \gg 1$ (but otherwise fixed),

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_n^*F_{A_i}|_\delta(x) &\le c\frac{\lambda_i^2}{r^4}, \\ |\varphi_n^*\tau_i^*A_i|_\delta(x) &\le c\frac{\lambda_i^2}{r^3}, \quad x \in \Omega(0;2L\lambda_i,\infty). \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

(Compare [58, Proposition 7.7] and [61, Lemmas 9.1 & 9.2]; the above decay estimates for the connection A_i with scale λ_i matches that of [58, Equations (7.16) & (7.17)], obtained by a slightly different method.) We can now integrate the preceding estimates (5.13) to get the following L^p bound, for any $1 \le p \le \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|F_{A_i}\|_{L^p(\Omega(0;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2),\delta)} &\le c\lambda_i^{2/p}, \\ \|\tau_i^*A_i\|_{L^p(\Omega(0;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2),\delta)} &\le c\lambda_i^{(2/p)+1/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

From the expression (5.11) for F_A over the inner annulus $\Omega(x_i;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2)$ and the L^p estimates (5.14) for F_{A_i}, $\tau_i^*A_i$ and that of Lemma 5.4 for $d\chi_i$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(\Omega(x_i;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2),g)} \\
&\leq c\|\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\|_{L^p(\Omega(x_i;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2),g)} \quad \text{(by [16, Lemma 4.1], for } 2<p\leq\infty) \\
&= c\|F_A^{+,g}\|_{L^p(\Omega(x_i;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2),g)} \\
&\leq c\|F_{A_i}^{+,g}\|_{L^p(\Omega(0;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2),\delta)} + c\|d\chi_i\|_{L^4}\|\tau_i^*A_i\|_{L^q(\Omega(0;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2),\delta)} \\
&\quad + c\|\tau_i^*A_i\|^2_{L^{2p}(\Omega(0;\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/2),\delta)} \\
&\leq C\left(\lambda_i^{2/p}+\lambda_i^{(2/q)+1/2}+\lambda_i^{2(p+(1/2))}\right)\leq C\lambda_i^{2/p},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

noting that $1/q=1/p-1/4$. This completes the required estimate for $F_A^{+,g}$ over the inner annulus.

Finally, we turn to the balls $B(x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4)$. We use *normal, but not necessarily normal geodesic* coordinates (see Remark 5.6) centered at x_i to attach the connections A_i, defined on $\mathbb{R}^4=(TX)_{x_i}$ with its standard metric δ. Just as in [58, Equation (8.20)], using $F_{A_i}^{+,\delta}=0$ and

$$F_{A_i}^{+,g}=\tfrac{1}{2}(1+*_g)F_{A_i}=\tfrac{1}{2}(*_g-*_\delta)F_{A_i}$$

gives, via $(\varphi_i^*g)_{\mu\nu}\equiv g_{\mu\nu}=\delta_{\mu\nu}+O(r)$ for x near $x_i\in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F_{A_i}^{+,g}\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(B(x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4))} &\leq c\|*_g-*_\delta\|\cdot\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(B(x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4))} \\
&\leq c\lambda_i^{1/2}\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(B(x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4))}.
\end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 5.3, we have for the standard round metric g_0 of radius one on S^4,

$$\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^\sharp(S^4,g_0)}\leq c\|F_{A_i}\|_{L^2(S^4,g_0)}, \tag{5.16}$$

for $c=c(\kappa_i)$ and all anti-self-dual connections A_i over S^4 with $c_2(A_i)=\kappa_i$. Therefore, combining the past two estimates, yields

$$\|\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(B(x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4))}=\|F_A^{+,g}\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(B(x_i,\sqrt{\lambda_i}/4))}\leq C\lambda_i^{1/2}. \tag{5.17}$$

The required bounds for $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$ now follow by combining the estimates (5.7), (5.10), and (5.15) for $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$ over the annuli where cutting off occurs, together with the estimates (5.6) for $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$ on the complement of the balls in X and the estimates (5.17) over the small balls, and fixing a value of $2<p\leq\infty$. We take p as close to 2 as possible (in order to get the best decay rate in terms of powers of λ), so a convenient value is $p=8/3$. □

Remark 5.6. The reasons for allowing any normal coordinates, rather than restricting to normal geodesic coordinates which would give sharper estimates, is explained in [27].

Remark 5.7. Suppose $B'\Subset B\subset X$ are concentric balls. If the precompact family $\mathcal{U}\subset\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)$ is a space of solutions to an extended PU(2) monopole equation defined by an eigenvalue cutoff constant $\mu>0$ (see §9),

$$\mathcal{C}(A_0,\Phi_0)=\Pi_{A_0,\Phi_0,\mu}\mathcal{C}(A_0,\Phi_0),$$

then Corollary 4.9 implies that — when $\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2(B)} + \|\Phi_0\|_{L^4(B)} < \varepsilon$ — we have the bound

$$\|(A_0 - \Gamma, \Phi_0)\|_{L^2_{k,\Gamma}(B')} \leq \left(\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2(B)} + \|\Phi_0\|^2_{L^2(B)} + \|\Phi_0\|_{L^2_{1,A_0}(B)} \right),$$

where $c = c(B', B, k)$ and $d^*_\Gamma(A_0 - \Gamma) = 0$, since standard linear elliptic theory gives

$$\|\Pi_{A_0,\Phi_0,\mu}\mathcal{C}(A_0, \Phi_0)\|_{L^2_{k,\Gamma}(B')} \leq c\|\mathcal{C}(A_0, \Phi_0)\|_{L^2(B)}.$$

The condition $\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2(B)} < \varepsilon$, for small enough $\varepsilon(B)$, ensures that Theorem 4.11 yields $\|A_0 - \Gamma\|_{L^2_{1,\Gamma}(B)} \leq c\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2(B)}$, with $A_0 - \Gamma$ in Coulomb gauge.

Remark 5.8. As we shall see in §9, it would be preferable to estimate the quantity $\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$ directly for the purposes of solving the extended PU(2) monopole equations, as $\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$ will be smaller than $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$, because we only assume that the background pairs (A_0, Φ_0) obey $\Pi^\perp_{A_0,\Phi_0,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A_0, \Phi_0) = 0$. However, as explained in §9, our estimate for $\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$ will suffice.

6. GLOBAL, UNIFORM ELLIPTIC ESTIMATES FOR THE ANTI-SELF-DUAL AND DIRAC OPERATORS

We recall some estimates [16], [18] for the operators d^+_A and D_A, with the property that all constants depend on the connection A at most through the L^2 norm of the curvature F_A. These estimates are used in §8 to allow us to identify the small-eigenvalue eigenspaces of the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ associated to the linearization $d^1_{A,\Phi}$ of the PU(2) monopole equations at a pair (A, Φ) and in §9 to give a uniform bound for a partial right inverse of this linearization.

Ultimately the desired global, uniform elliptic estimates rely on the following Bochner-Weitzenböck formulas, which we collect here for convenience:

$$d_A d^*_A + 2d^{+,*}_A d^+_A = \nabla^*_A\nabla_A + \{\mathrm{Ric}, \cdot\} - 2\{F^-_A, \cdot\}, \tag{6.1}$$

$$2d^+_A d^{+,*}_A = \nabla^*_A\nabla_A - 2\{\mathcal{W}^+, \cdot\} + \frac{R}{3} + \{F^+_A, \cdot\}, \tag{6.2}$$

$$D^*_A D_A = \nabla^*_A\nabla_A + \frac{R}{4} + \rho(F^+_A) + \frac{1}{2}\rho(F^+_{A_d} + F^+_{A_e}), \tag{6.3}$$

$$D_A D^*_A = \nabla^*_A\nabla_A + \frac{R}{4} + \rho(F^-_A) + \frac{1}{2}\rho(F^+_{A_d} + F^+_{A_e}), \tag{6.4}$$

for the Laplacians on $\Gamma(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$, $\Gamma(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$, $\Gamma(V^+)$, and $\Gamma(V^-)$, respectively; see [33, p. 94] for the first two formulas and [29, Lemma 4.1] for the third and fourth. Here, A is viewed as an SO(3) connection on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ (see the conventions described in §2 and A_d, A_e are the U(1) connections on $\det W^+$ and $\det E$, respectively.

As we shall see in §8 and §9, the presence of the F^-_A term in the Bochner formula (6.4) for $D_A D^*_A$, unlike the F^+_A term in the Bochner formula (6.2), means that we cannot simply imitate the strategy of [62] in our construction of gluing solutions of the PU(2) monopole equations.

6.1. **Elliptic estimates for the anti-self-dual operator.**

In this subsection we recall the elliptic estimates for the *anti-self-dual operator* d_A^+ described in [16]. The following Kato-Sobolev inequality is well-known and will be frequently employed; see Lemma 4.6 in [58] for the case $p = 2$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let X be a C^∞, closed, oriented, Riemannian, four-manifold and let $1 \le p < 4$. Then there is a positive constant c with the following significance. Let A be an orthogonal L_1^p connection on a Riemannian vector bundle V over X. Then, for any $a \in L_1^p(V)$ and $4/3 \le q < \infty$ defined by $1/p = 1/q + 1/4$, we have*

$$\|a\|_{L^q(X)} \le c\|a\|_{L^p_{1,A}(X)}. \tag{6.5}$$

The estimates for d_A^+ we require are treated in detail in [16], based on earlier work of Taubes, so we just summarize the results here; the $L^\sharp$ and related families of Sobolev-Taubes norms are defined in [16, §4].

Lemma 6.2. [16, Lemma 5.9] *Let X be a C^∞, closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold. Then there are positive constants c and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(c)$ with the following significance. Let E be a Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle over X and let A be an orthogonal L_4^2 connection on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ with curvature F_A, such that $\|F_A\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)} < \varepsilon$. Then the following estimate holds for any $v \in L_2^{\sharp,2}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$:*

$$\|v\|_{L^2_{2,A}(X)} + \|v\|_{C^0(X)} \le c(1 + \|F_A\|_{L^2(X)})(\|d_A^+ d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)} + \|v\|_{L^2(X)}). \tag{6.6}$$

The preceding lemma is proved via a (subtle) integration-by-parts argument (due to Taubes), together with the Bochner formula (6.2) to replace the covariant Laplacian $\nabla_A^*\nabla_A$ by $d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}$. In §9 we shall use the following consequence of Lemma 6.2:

Corollary 6.3. [16, Corollary 5.10] *Continue the hypotheses of Lemma 6.2. Then:*

$$\|d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \le c(1 + \|F_A\|_{L^2(X)})(\|d_A^+ d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)} + \|v\|_{L^2(X)}). \tag{6.7}$$

Note that any $a \in \Gamma(\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$ which is L^2-orthogonal to $\operatorname{Ker} d_A^+$ is given by $a = d_A^{+,*} v$, for some $v \in \Gamma(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$. We shall also use the following $L^2_{1,A}$ estimates for $v \in \Gamma(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$; similar estimates are given in [58, Lemma 5.2] and in [60, Appendix A]; they follow from an elementary application of the Bochner formula (6.2).

Lemma 6.4. [20, Lemma 6.6] *Let X be a C^∞, closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold. Then there are positive constants c and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(c)$ with the following significance. Let A be an L_4^2 orthogonal connection on an* SO(3) *bundle $\mathfrak{g}_E$ over X such that $\|F_A^+\|_{L^2} < \varepsilon$. Then, for all $v \in L_2^{4/3}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$,*

$$\|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \le c(1 + \|F_A^+\|_{L^2(X)})^{1/2}(\|d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^2(X)} + \|v\|_{L^2(X)}), \tag{6.8}$$

$$\|d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^2(X)} \le (1 + \|F_A^+\|_{L^2(X)})^{1/2}\left(\|d_A^+ d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^{4/3}(X)} + \|v\|_{L^2(X)}\right) \tag{6.9}$$

6.2. **Elliptic estimates for the Dirac operator.**

In this subsection we recall the elliptic estimates for the Dirac operator D_A proved in [16]. An application of Lemma 5.5 in [16] and the Bochner formula (6.2) yields

Lemma 6.5. [18, Lemma 7.2] *Let X be a closed, oriented four-manifold with metric g. Let $0 \le M < \infty$ be a constant. Then there are positive constants $c(g,M)$ and $\varepsilon(g)$ with the following significance. Let (ρ, W^+, W^-) be a spin^c structure over X with spin^c connection determined by the Levi-Civita connection on T^*X and a complex L^2_4 connection A_d on $\det W^+$ with $\|F_{A_d}\|_{L^\infty(X)} \le M$. Let E be a Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle over X with unitary L^2_4 connection A_e on $\det E$ with $\|F_{A_e}\|_{L^\infty(X)} \le M$. Denote $V = W \otimes E$ and $V^\pm = W^\pm \otimes E$. Suppose A is an orthogonal L^2_4 connection on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ for which $X = U_2^+ \cup U_\infty^+$, with $U_2^+, U_\infty^+ \Subset X$ open subsets such that $\|F_A^+\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(U_2^+)} < \varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\|F_A^+\|_{C^0(U_\infty^+)} \le M < \infty$. If $\phi^+ \in L^2_3(X, V^+)$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi^+\|_{C^0\cap L^2_{2,A}(X)} \le c(1 + \|F_A\|_{L^2(X)})^2 (1 + \|F_A^+\|_{C^0(U_\infty^+)})^2 \\ \times (\|D_A^- D_A^+ \phi^+\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)} + \|\phi^+\|_{L^2(X)}). \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

The analogous estimate holds for $\phi^- \in L^2_3(X, V^-)$, with F_A^+ replaced by F_A^-.

Since $\|D_A^+\phi^+\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le c\|\phi^+\|_{L^2_{2,A}}$, Lemma 6.5 yields an $L^2_{1,A}$ estimate for $D_A^+\phi$:

Corollary 6.6. [18, Corollary 7.3] *Continue the hypotheses of Lemma 6.5. Then:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_A^+\phi^+\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \le c(1 + \|F_A\|_{L^2(X)})^2 (1 + \|F_A^+\|_{C^0(U_\infty^+)})^2 \\ \times (\|D_A^- D_A^+ \phi^+\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)} + \|\phi^+\|_{L^2(X)}). \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

The analogous estimate holds for $D_A^-\phi^- \in L^2_2(X, V^+)$, with F_A^+ replaced by F_A^-.

Now Lemma 6.5 and Corollary 6.6 provide useful $C^0 \cap L^2_{2,A}(X)$ elliptic estimates for positive spinors $\phi^+ \in \Gamma(X, V^+)$ and useful $L^2_{1,A}(X)$ elliptic estimates for $D_A^+\phi^+ \in \Gamma(X, V^-)$ even when A bubbles, because we still have uniform C^0 bounds for F_A^+ away from the bubble points (on the set U_∞) and small $L^{\sharp,2}$ bounds around the bubble points (on the set U_2). However, this is never the case for F_A^- in such applications — because F_A^- is neither C^0-bounded nor $L^{\sharp,2}$-small around the bubble points — so neither Lemma 6.5 nor Corollary 6.6 provide useful $C^0 \cap L^2_{2,A}(X)$ elliptic estimates for $\phi^- \in \Gamma(X, V^-)$ or useful $L^2_{1,A}(X)$ elliptic estimates for $D_A^-\phi^- \in \Gamma(X, V^+)$.

To partly address this problem and obtain estimates strong enough to meet the demands of §8 and §9, we recall that eigenspinors (both positive and negative) satisfy a useful decay estimates [18] on the complement of balls where the curvature is L^2-concentrated. These were used in [18] to derive Sobolev estimates for spinors on the complement of such balls:

Proposition 6.7. [18, Proposition 7.4] *Continue the hypotheses of Lemma 6.5. If $\phi \in L^2_2(X, V^-)$, write $\phi = \phi_0 + \phi_\perp$, where $\phi_0 \in \operatorname{Ker} D_A^-$ and $\phi_\perp \in (\operatorname{Ker} D_A^-)^\perp$, so that $\phi_\perp = D_A^+\varphi$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_\perp\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \le c(1 + \|F_A\|_{L^2(X)})^2 (1 + \|F_A^+\|_{C^0(U_\infty)})^2 \\ \times (\|D_A^-\phi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)} + \|\varphi\|_{L^2(X)}). \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

If $U = X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, \lambda_i^{1/2})$ and $U' = X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 2\lambda_i^{1/3}) \Subset U$ and $\max_i \lambda_i \le 1$, then

$$\|\phi_0\|_{C^0\cap L^2_{2,A}(U')} \le c(1 + \|F_A\|_{L^2(X)})(1 + \|F_A^-\|_{C^0(U)})\|\phi_0\|_{L^2(U)}. \tag{6.13}$$

In contrast, a simple integration-by-parts argument yields the corresponding bound for $\phi \in \Gamma(X, V^+)$:

Lemma 6.8. [18, Lemma 7.5] *Continue the hypotheses of Lemma 6.5. Then, for any $\phi \in L^2_1(X, V^+)$, we have*

$$\|\phi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \leq c\left(1 + \|F_A^+\|_{C^0(U_\infty)}\right)^{1/2}(\|D_A^+\phi\|_{L^2(X)} + \|\phi\|_{L^2(X)}). \tag{6.14}$$

Remark 6.9. Lemma 5.9 in [29] yields the bound $\|F_A\|_{L^\sharp} \leq c\|F_A\|_{L^2}$ if A is an anti-self-dual connection. The proof yields the same answer if A satisfies another elliptic equation. In the present application, A will be obtained by splicing anti-self-dual connections over S^4 onto a background connection over X satisfying the extended PU(2) monopole equations. Since the background family is always precompact, we may assume a bound of the form $\|F_A\|_{L^\sharp} \leq c\|F_A\|_{L^2}$ without loss.

From the Hodge theorem, we have an L^2-orthogonal splitting

$$L^2_{k-1}(V^-) = \operatorname{Ker} D_A^* \oplus \operatorname{Ran} D_A,$$

where $D_A^* : L^2_{k+1}(V^-) \to L^2_k(V^+)$ and $D_A : L^2_k(V^+) \to L^2_{k-1}(V^-)$. It remains to estimate the harmonic components of sections in $L^2_{k-1}(V^-)$. Because of the presence of the F_A^- term in the Bochner formula (6.4) for $D_A D_A^*$, we cannot expect to obtain global $L^p(X)$ estimates for $\psi \in \operatorname{Ker} D_A^* = \operatorname{Ker} D_A D_A^*$ when $p > 2$. However, in the course of deriving an estimate for the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ we shall see that it is enough to derive an $L^2_{1,A}$ estimate for $\psi \in \operatorname{Ker} D_A^*$ upon restriction to $\operatorname{supp}\Phi$. For this purpose, it is enough to have decay estimates for such ψ away from the points of curvature concentration and in the support of Φ.

7. THE DIRICHLET PROBLEM FOR THE DIRAC LAPLACIAN

Our goal in this section is to prove the following elliptic estimate. This estimate plays a crucial role in the proof of Corollary 9.3, which gives a uniform bound for a partial right inverse of the linearization of the PU(2) monopole equations.

Theorem 7.1. *Let M be a positive constant. Let $0 < 4r_0 < r_1 < \infty$ and consider an annulus $\tilde\Omega = \Omega(r_0, r_1) = B(r_1) - \bar B(r_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ centered at the origin, with C^∞ metric g of bounded geometry and injectivity radius large compared with r_1. Let $\Omega = \Omega(t_0, t_1) \Subset \tilde\Omega$ and $\Omega' = \Omega(2t_0, t_1/2) \Subset \Omega$, where $r_0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq r_1$ and $r_0 t_0^{-3}, r_1^{-2} \leq M$. Let A be an C^∞ spin^c connection on a Hermitian bundle $V|_{\tilde\Omega}$, where $V = V^+ \oplus V^-$ and $V^\pm \cong \tilde\Omega \times \mathbb{C}^4$. Suppose F_A and the curvature Rm_g of the Levi-Civita connection for g on $T\mathbb{R}^4$ obeys*

$$\|\operatorname{Rm}_g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M, \tag{7.1}$$

$$\|F_A\|_{L^2(\tilde\Omega)} < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|\operatorname{Rm}_g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \varepsilon. \tag{7.2}$$

Then there is a positive constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(M, p, r_1)$ such that the following holds. For any $1 < p \leq 2$ there is a constant $C = C(M, p, r_1)$ such that for all $\psi \in L^p_2(\Omega, V)$ we have

$$\|\psi\|_{L^p_{2,A}(\Omega')} \leq C(\|D_A D_A^*\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(\Omega)}). \tag{7.3}$$

In our applications of Theorem 7.1 in §9, the constant r_1 will typically be fixed while the constant r_0 is allowed to approach zero: the essential point in the estimate (7.3) is that the dependence of the constant C on Ω is known and, in particular, remains bounded as $r_0 \to 0$. The annulus $\Omega(r_0, r_1)$ will be thought of as surrounding a ball where the curvature of an SO(3) connection A^o on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ is allowed to bubble inside the ball but remains L^∞ bounded on $\Omega(r_0, r_1)$, where $V = W \otimes E$, with spin^c connection on V determined by A^o on $\mathfrak{g}_E$, A_d on $\det W^+$, A_e on $\det E$, and the Levi-Civita connection on T^*X. Usually, the constant r_0 will be a constant multiple of λ, the local scale of the connection A. The slightly unusual conditions on the relative sizes of the radii r_0, r_1 arises because of the application in the proof of our decay estimates for eigenspinors [18, Theorem 1.1]. The dependence of the constant C on r_1 arises through

- The first Dirichlet eigenvalue of the scalar Laplacian on a ball of radius r_1 in $\mathbb{R}^4$ (Remark 7.8), and
- The dependence of the norm $K = K(\Omega)$ of the Sobolev embedding [2, Theorem V.5.4]

$$L^2_1(\Omega) \subset L^4(\Omega) \tag{7.4}$$

on the geometry of the largest interior cone defining the interior cone property for Ω: the hypothesis $r_0 < r_1/4$ ensures that this depends on r_1 but not r_0. The constant r_1 determines the maximum height of the cone with respect to which the annulus $\Omega(r_0, r_1)$ satisfies an interior cone condition — see [2, §IV.3 & Theorem V.5.4].

The Sobolev constant K also depends, in general, on the C^0 bounds for the curvature Rm_g of the Riemannian metric g and its injectivity radius, which we shall always assume to be much larger than r_1 [6, §II.7].

We can assume without loss that A extends to a C^∞ connection (not necessarily Yang-Mills) on $\mathbb{R}^4 \cup \{\infty\}$ with small curvature and write

$$A = \Gamma + a, \tag{7.5}$$

with Γ being the product connection on $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{C}^4$. Rather than assume that the spin^c connection A is Yang-Mills, in our application to connections A produced by the splicing construction of §3, it suffices to assume that the SO(3) connection A^o is Yang-Mills, while the fixed U(1) connections A_d and A_e obey a curvature constraint of the same shape as (7.2). (Of course, we can always assume without loss that A_d and A_e are Yang-Mills.) If $a = A - \Gamma$ is a connection one-form on $(\mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\}) \cup \{\infty\}$ in radial gauge with respect to the point at infinity, whose extension we take to be Yang-Mills for simplicity (as will be true in our application), then Corollary 5.2 and the proof of inequality (5.12) imply

$$|\nabla^k_\Gamma a|_\delta(x) \le c_k \frac{r_0^2}{r^{3+k}} \|F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega(r_0,\infty),\delta)}, \quad 2r_0 < r < \infty, \tag{7.6}$$

provided only that $\|F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega(r_0,\infty),\delta)} < \varepsilon$, where ε is a universal constant and $k \ge 0$ is any integer. We denote $r = |x| = \mathrm{dist}_\delta(0, x)$, and δ is the standard metric on $\mathbb{R}^4$. This result, aside from a consideration of the precise constants involved, is Lemma 9.2 in [61]. In our application, we at most need the estimate (7.6) when $k \le 1$, A has scale λ, and $r_0 = L\lambda$, with $L \gg 1$ a fixed, universal constant. Inequality (7.6) yields the useful bound

$$\|a\|_{L^\infty_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega)} \le M, \tag{7.7}$$

while the bound

$$\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M \tag{7.8}$$

would follow directly from Theorem 5.1, where Ω in inequalities (7.7) and (7.8) can be taken to be $\Omega(2\sqrt{r_0}, \infty)$ if $r_0 \leq 1$ and simply $\Omega(2r_0, \infty)$ if $r_0 \geq 1$.

7.1. **The Dirichlet problem for scalar, second-order elliptic equations.** To begin, we recall some results from [35] concerning elliptic, second-order differential equations for functions on domains in Euclidean space. First, we shall need the following consequence of the Calderon-Zygmund inequality [35, Theorem 9.9 & Corollary 9.10], [57]:

Lemma 7.2. [35, Lemma 9.17] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain whose boundary $\partial\Omega$ is a $C^{1,1}$ submanifold. Let*

$$\mathcal{L} = a^{\mu\nu}(x)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_\mu \partial x_\nu} + b^\mu(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\mu} + c(x) \tag{7.9}$$

be a strictly elliptic *second-order differential operator on Ω, so $a^{\mu\nu}\xi_\mu\xi_\nu \geq \lambda|\xi|^2$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x \in \Omega$, for some positive constant λ. Require that the coefficients obey $a^{\mu\nu} \in C^0(\bar{\Omega})$, $b^\mu, c \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and $c \leq 0$, with $|a^{\mu\nu}|, |b^\mu|, |c| \leq \Lambda$, for some positive constant Λ. Let $K = \max\{\|a^{\mu\nu}\|_{C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})}, \|b^\mu\|_{C^{0,1}(\bar{\Omega})}, \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\}$. Then there is a constant $C = C(K, n, p, \lambda, \Lambda, \Omega)$ such that for all $u \in L^p_2(\Omega) \cap L^p_1(\Omega; \partial\Omega)$, $1 < p < \infty$,*

$$\|u\|_{L^p_2(\Omega)} \leq C\|\mathcal{L}u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{7.10}$$

See also Theorem 9.14 in [35] for a similar statement, under slightly different hypotheses. We shall also need results concerning the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the Dirichlet boundary-value problem:

Theorem 7.3. [35, Theorem 9.15 & Corollary 9.18] *Continue the hypotheses of Lemma 7.10. If $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ and $\varphi \in L^p_2(\Omega)$, with $1 < p < \infty$, then the Dirichlet problem*

$$\mathcal{L}u = f \quad \text{on } \Omega, \quad u - \varphi \in L^p_1(\Omega; \partial\Omega) \tag{7.11}$$

has a unique solution $u \in L^p_2(\Omega)$. If $p > n/2$ and $\varphi \in C^0(\partial\Omega)$, then the Dirichlet problem

$$\mathcal{L}u = f \quad \text{on } \Omega, \quad u = \varphi \in \partial\Omega \tag{7.12}$$

has a unique solution $u \in L^p_{2,\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega})$.

Lastly, we recall the following regularity results for solutions to the Dirichlet problem:

Theorem 7.4. [35, Theorem 9.19] *Continue the hypotheses of Lemma 7.10. Suppose the coefficients of $\mathcal{L}$ belong to $C^{k-1,1}(\Omega)$ (respectively, $C^{k-1,\alpha}(\Omega)$), and $f \in L^q_{k,\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ (respectively, $C^{k-1,\alpha}(\Omega)$), with $1 < p, q < \infty$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$. If $u \in L^p_{2,\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ is a solution to $\mathcal{L}u = f$, then $u \in L^q_{k+2,\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$ (respectively, $C^{k+1,\alpha}(\Omega)$).*

Furthermore, if Ω is a $C^{k+1,1}$ domain, $\mathcal{L}$ has coefficients in $C^{k-1,1}(\bar{\Omega})$ (respectively, $C^{k-1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$), and $f \in L^q_k(\Omega)$ (respectively, $C^{k-1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$), then $u \in L^q_{k+2}(\Omega)$ (respectively, $C^{k+1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$).

7.2. **The Dirichlet problem for harmonic spinors on an annulus.** The main purpose of this subsection is to prove Theorem 7.5, the analogue for the Dirac Laplacian of the existence, uniqueness, and regularity results for the scalar, second-order elliptic equation in the preceding subsection.

We outline the strategy in a series of lemmas. We first have the following analogues of Theorems 8.3 and 8.13 and Corollary 8.7 in [35], which solve the Dirichlet problem for second-order, linear elliptic operators on functions over domains in Euclidean space. While we could appeal to standard results for elliptic boundary-value problems for systems, such as those of [3], [4], [39, §20.2], and [49, §§6.2–6.5], it is essential for our application in the remainder of our article that we know the precise dependence, if any, of the constants appearing in estimates on the geometry of the domain Ω and the curvature F_A of the connection A. Hence, we instead proceed by modifying the arguments of [35, §§8.1–8.4 & 9.5, 9.6] for the Dirichlet boundary-value problem for the second-order, linear, elliptic operator on functions.

Note that because we are only considering the Dirichlet problem in Theorem 7.5 for covariant Laplacians or Laplacians plus zeroth-order terms, we do not encounter the obstructions to prescribing local boundary conditions for operators of Dirac type discussed in [5].

We write $L^p_k(\Omega,\partial\Omega)$ for the closure in $L^p_k(\Omega)$ of the subspace $C^\infty_0(\Omega)$, rather than $W^{k,p}_0(\Omega)$ and $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$, as is customary in [2] or [35].

Theorem 7.5. *Let* $0 < 4r_0 < r_1 < \infty$ *and let* $\Omega = \Omega(r_0, r_1)$ *be the open annulus* $B(r_1) - \bar B(r_0)$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^4$ *with* C^∞ *metric* g *on* $\mathbb{R}^4$ *of bounded geometry, with injectivity radius* $\geq r_1$ *and* $\|\mathrm{Rm}_g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M < \infty$. *Let* A *be a* C^∞ *spin*^{c} *connection on a Hermitian vector bundle* $V = V^+ \oplus V^-$, *where* $V^\pm \cong \Omega\times\mathbb{C}^4$ *and let* D_A *be the Dirac operator on* $\Gamma(\Omega, V)$, *with Bochner form* $\nabla_A^*\nabla_A + \mathcal{R}_A$. *Then there is a positive constant* $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\min\{1, r_1\}, M)$ *such that if*

$$\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \varepsilon, \tag{7.13}$$

then the following holds. Let $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $\psi \in L^p_2(\Omega, V)$.

1. *There is a unique solution* $h \in L^p_2(\Omega, V)$ *to the Dirichlet problem*

$$D_A^2 h = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega \text{ and } \quad h - \psi \in L^p_2(\Omega, \partial\Omega; V). \tag{7.14}$$

   If $p > 2$ *and* $\psi \in C^0(\partial\Omega)$, *then there is a unique solution* $h \in C^0(\bar\Omega, V) \cap L^p_{2,\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega, V)$ *to the Dirichlet problem*

$$D_A^2 h = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega \text{ and } \quad h = \psi \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{7.15}$$

2. *The solution* h *obeys the* a priori *estimate*

$$\|h\|_{L^2_{1,A}(\Omega)} \leq c\|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(\Omega)}, \tag{7.16}$$

   where $c = c(r_1, M)$.

The same results holds for the Dirichlet problem for the covariant Laplacian, $\nabla_A^*\nabla_A$, *as in that case one simply has* $\mathcal{R}_A = 0$.

Note that when $V = W \otimes E$, the exact form of $\mathcal{R}_A$ is given by the Bochner formulas (6.3), (6.4), with "A" in those expressions being the SO(3) connection on $\mathfrak{g}_E$.

We first record a few elementary integration-by-parts formulas which we shall need for the proof of Theorem 7.5. Let $\Omega \subset X$ be an open subset with boundary $\partial\Omega \subset X$ a compact, smooth submanifold. From [45, Equation (II.8.1)] and the Divergence Theorem, we have

$$\int_\Omega \langle \nabla_A^*\nabla_A\varphi_1, \varphi_2\rangle \, dV = \int_\Omega \langle \nabla_A\varphi_1, \nabla_A\varphi_2\rangle \, dV - \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \nabla_{A,\nu}\varphi_1, \varphi_2\rangle \, dS, \tag{7.17}$$

where ν is the outward-pointing unit-normal vector field on $\partial\Omega$. Similarly, as

$$d\langle\varphi_1, \varphi_2\rangle = \langle\nabla_A\varphi_1, \varphi_2\rangle + \langle\varphi_1, \nabla_A\varphi_2\rangle,$$

we have

$$\int_\Omega \langle \nabla_A\varphi_1, \varphi_2\rangle \, dV = -\int_\Omega \langle \varphi_1, \nabla_A\varphi_2\rangle \, dV + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \varphi_1, \varphi_2\rangle \, dS. \tag{7.18}$$

We shall also need the corresponding integration-by-parts formulas for the Dirac operator. Recall from [45, Proposition II.5.3 & Equation (II.5.7)] that

$$\int_\Omega \langle D_A\psi_1, \psi_2\rangle \, dV = \int_\Omega \langle \psi_1, D_A\psi_2\rangle \, dV + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \rho(\nu^*)\psi_1, \psi_2\rangle \, dS, \tag{7.19}$$

$$\int_\Omega \langle D_A^2\psi_1, \psi_2\rangle \, dV = \int_\Omega \langle D_A\psi_1, D_A\psi_2\rangle \, dV + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \rho(\nu^*)D_A\psi_1, \psi_2\rangle \, dS, \tag{7.20}$$

where $\nu^* = g(\cdot, \nu)$ is the one-form on $\partial\Omega$ dual to the outward-pointing unit-normal vector field ν. We now turn to some preparatory lemmas.

Lemma 7.6. *Let $\mu_1(\Omega; \Delta)$ denote the first eigenvalue of the Laplacian Δ on $C^\infty(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{C})$, for a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with the standard metric and Dirichlet boundary condition on $\partial\Omega$. If B is the unit ball and Ω_ε the annulus $B(0,1) - \bar{B}(0,\varepsilon)$, then $\mu_1(B; \Delta)$ is the first positive zero of the Bessel function $J_{(n-2)/2}$ and $\mu_1(\Omega_\varepsilon; \Delta) > \mu_1(B; \Delta)$ for all $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. In particular, if $n = 4$, then $\mu_1(B; \Delta) \approx 3.83171$, the first positive zero of the Bessel function J_1.*

Proof. The calculation of the first (and all higher) eigenvalues of the Dirichlet Laplacian on $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ can be found, for example, in [32, pp. 106–107]. The lower bound on $\mu_1(\Omega_\varepsilon; \Delta)$ is a consequence of domain monotonicity of eigenvalues for the Laplacian with Dirichlet boundary conditions [8, Corollary I.1]. □

Lemma 7.6 leads to a lower bound on the first eigenvalue of the Dirac Laplacian on the annulus Ω_ε. Recall that the Bochner formula for the Dirac Laplacian gives $D_A^2 = \nabla_A^*\nabla_A + \mathcal{R}_A$ on $C^\infty(\Omega, V)$ and if we restrict to sections of V^+ or V^-, then $\mathcal{R}_A$ is replaced by $\mathcal{R}_A^+$ or $\mathcal{R}_A^-$.

Lemma 7.7. *Continue the notation and hypotheses of Lemma 7.6. Let $\mu_1(\Omega; \nabla_A^*\nabla_A)$, respectively $\mu_1(\Omega; D_A^2)$, denote the first eigenvalue of the covariant Laplacian $\nabla_A^*\nabla_A$, respectively the Dirac Laplacian D_A^2, on $C^\infty(\Omega, \partial\Omega; V)$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega$. Let $K = K(\Omega)$ denote the norm of the Sobolev $L_1^2(\Omega) \to L^4(\Omega)$. Then*

$$\mu_1(\Omega_\varepsilon; \nabla_A^*\nabla_A) \geq \mu_1(\Omega_\varepsilon; \Delta) \geq \mu_1(B; \Delta) > 0, \tag{7.21}$$

and

$$\mu_1(\Omega_\varepsilon; D_A^2) \geq (1 - K\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)})\mu_1(B; \Delta) - K\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{7.22}$$

which is positive for small enough $\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega_\varepsilon)}$. *If we restrict the Dirac Laplacian* D_A^2 *to sections of* V^+ *or* V^-, *then* $\mathcal{R}_A$ *is replaced by* $\mathcal{R}_A^+$ *or* $\mathcal{R}_A^-$ *above.*

Remark 7.8. The balls and annuli in Lemmas 7.7 and 7.6 have outer radii equal to 1. If the radii are multiplied by a factor r_1, then the eigenvalues are multiplied by a factor r_1^{-2} [8, §XII.7].

Proof. The first Dirichlet eigenvalue of the covariant Laplacian $\nabla_A^*\nabla_A$ on $C^\infty(\Omega,\partial\Omega;V)$ is given by

$$\mu_1(\Omega;\nabla_A^*\nabla_A) = \inf_{\substack{\|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1,\\ \psi=0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega}} \|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where the infimum is taken over smooth sections. The Kato inequality $|\nabla|\psi|| \leq |\nabla_A\psi|$ and the analogous characterization of $\mu_1(\Omega;\Delta)$ imply that

$$\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq \|\nabla|\psi|\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \geq \mu_1(\Omega;\Delta).$$

The desired estimate now follows from Lemma 7.6.

Similarly, the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of the Dirac Laplacian D_A^2 on $C^\infty(\Omega,\partial\Omega;V)$ is given by

$$\mu_1(\Omega;D_A^2) = \inf_{\substack{\|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}=1,\\ \psi=0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega}} \|D_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2,$$

where the infimum is taken over smooth sections. Applying the Bochner formula and integration by parts, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &= (D_A^2\psi,\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= (\nabla_A^*\nabla_A\psi,\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} + (\mathcal{R}_A\psi,\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\geq \|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\psi\|_{L^4(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\geq \|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - c\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}(\|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2) \\
&\geq (1 - c\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)})\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - c\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\geq (1 - c\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)})\mu_1(\Omega;\nabla_A^*\nabla_A) - c\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality (7.22) now follows from the eigenvalue estimate (7.21). □

We can now turn to our proof of the *a priori* L_1^2 estimate.

Proof of inequality (7.16) *in Theorem 7.5.* Since

$$\|h\|_{L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)} \leq \|h-\psi\|_{L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)}, \tag{7.23}$$

it suffices to estimate the $L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)$ norm of $h-\psi$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|h-\psi\|_{L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)} &\leq \|h-\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \mu_1^{-1/2}\|D_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by Lemma 7.7)} \qquad (7.24)\\
&\leq c\|\nabla_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu_1 = \mu_1(\Omega; D_A^2)$. Using integration by parts (7.17) and the facts that $h - \psi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $D_A^2 h = 0$ on Ω, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &= (\nabla_A^*\nabla_A(h-\psi), h-\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= (D_A^2(h-\psi), h-\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} + (\mathcal{R}_A(h-\psi), h-\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= -(D_A^2\psi, h-\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} + (\mathcal{R}_A(h-\psi), h-\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&= -(D_A\psi, D_A(h-\psi))_{L^2(\Omega)} + (\mathcal{R}_A(h-\psi), h-\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\le c\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|h-\psi\|_{L^4(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\le c\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\nabla_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + K\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|h-\psi\|_{L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $K = K(\Omega)$ is the norm of the Sobolev embedding $L_{1,A}^2(\Omega) \to L^4(\Omega)$. Therefore, using the interpolation inequality $xy \le \varepsilon x^2 + \varepsilon^{-1}y^2$ and the bound $\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)} < \varepsilon \cdot \min\{1, K^{-1}\}$, (by hypothesis (7.13)) the preceding inequality gives

$$\|\nabla_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le c\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \varepsilon\left(\|\nabla_A(h-\psi)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|h-\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right). \tag{7.25}$$

Combining inequalities (7.24) and (7.25) and using rearrangement yields

$$\|h-\psi\|_{L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)} \le c\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}. \tag{7.26}$$

Hence, the a priori estimate (7.16) follows from inequalities (7.23) and (7.26). □

With the preceding lemmas at hand, we can now complete the proof of Theorem 7.5.

Proof of Theorem 7.5. Observe that the given Dirichlet problem, $D_A^2 h' = 0$ and $h' - \psi' \in L_2^p(\Omega, \partial\Omega; V)$, is equivalent to

$$D_A^2 h = \psi \quad \text{on } \Omega \text{ and } \quad h \in L_2^p(\Omega, \partial\Omega; V), \tag{7.27}$$

if we take $h = h' - \psi' \in L_2^p(\Omega, \partial\Omega; V)$ and $\psi = -D_A^2\psi' \in L^p(\Omega; V)$. Let $\mathcal{H} = L_1^2(\Omega, \partial\Omega; V)$ and define a bilinear form $\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\mathcal{B}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = (\varphi_1, D_A^2\varphi_2)_{L^2(\Omega)} = (D_A\varphi_1, D_A\varphi_2)_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Similarly, define $\psi^* \in \mathcal{H}^*$ by setting

$$\psi^*(\varphi) = (\varphi, \psi)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{H},$$

noting that $(\varphi, \psi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \cdot \|\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$, so $\psi^* : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a continuous map, as claimed. Integrating by parts and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 7.7 we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi\|_{L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)}^2 &= \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\nabla_A\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\le \mu_1^{-1}\|D_A\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|D_A\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - (\mathcal{R}_A\varphi, \varphi)_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\le (1+\mu_1^{-1})\|D_A\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\varphi\|_{L^4(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\le (1+\mu_1^{-1})\|D_A\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + K\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|\varphi\|_{L_{1,A}^2(\Omega)}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant $K(\Omega)$ depends only on the geometry of cone defining the interior cone property for Ω [2, §IV.3] by the Sobolev embedding $L_1^2(\Omega) \subset L^4(\Omega)$ [2, Theorem V.5.4]. By hypothesis (7.13), we may suppose $\|\mathcal{R}_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{1}{2}K^{-2}$ and hence rearrangement in the last inequality yields

$$\|\varphi\|^2_{L^2_{1,A}(\Omega)} \leq c'\mathcal{B}(\varphi,\varphi), \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{H},$$

with $c' = 2(1+\mu_1^{-1})$. Thus, $\mathcal{B}$ is a bounded, coercive bilinear form on $\mathcal{H}$ (see, for example, [35, Equation (5.11)]). The Lax-Milgram theorem [35, §5.8] then implies that the map $\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}^*$, $\varphi \mapsto \mathcal{B}(\cdot,\varphi)$ is continuous and bijective — with continuous inverse by the open mapping theorem — and consequently there is a unique solution $h \in \mathcal{H}$ to the equation

$$\mathcal{B}(\varphi,h) = (\varphi,\psi)_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathcal{H}.$$

In other words, there is unique weak solution $h \in L^2_1(\Omega,\partial\Omega;V)$ to the Dirichlet problem $D^2_A h = \psi$. Standard regularity arguments ensure that h is a strong (or classical) solution, with the asserted regularity properties for a given ψ [35]. Let

$$G_A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}, \quad \psi \mapsto \psi^* \mapsto \mathcal{B}(\cdot,h) \mapsto h$$

be the Green's operator for the Dirichlet problem $D^2_A h = \psi$, $h \in L^2_1(\Omega,\partial\Omega;V)$. Since G_A can be written as a composition of continuous operators,

$$L^2_1(\Omega;V) \to L^2(\Omega;V) \to L^2(\Omega;V)^* \to L^2_1(\Omega,\partial\Omega;V)^* \to L^2_1(\Omega,\partial\Omega;V),$$

with the first embedding being compact by Rellich's theorem [2] (for bounded Ω), then G_A is compact. Therefore, G_A has a discrete spectrum and zero as the only possible limit point; the spectrum is real since G_A is seen to be self-adjoint in the usual way. Hence, D^2_A has a discrete, real spectrum with no limit points. □

7.3. L^p_2 elliptic estimates for spinors over annuli.

In this subsection we complete the proof of Theorem 7.1, the main result of this section.

We shall need elliptic estimates for negative spinors, that is L^2_{k+1} sections of $V^- = W^-\otimes E$, over open subsets of X where the curvature F_A obeys a C^0 bound which is uniform with respect to A. The desired estimates are fairly delicate, as the domain in question is of the form $U = X - \cup_{i=1}^m B(x_i, 4\lambda_i^{1/3})$ and we require estimates which are uniform with respect to the ball radii. In particular, the estimates we need do not follow from a simple application of the standard elliptic estimate for $D_A D_A^*$ over X using cutoff functions equal to one on the complement of these balls and equal to zero on the smaller balls $B(x_i, 2\lambda_i^{1/3})$.

We shall need the following analogue — in the case of Sobolev norms of sections of a Hermitian bundle V defined via covariant derivatives — of the interpolation inequality given by [35, Theorem 7.27] for Sobolev norms of functions on domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$:

Lemma 7.9. *Let Ω be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, not necessarily bounded. Let Γ denote the product connection on $V \cong \Omega\times\mathbb{C}^r$ and suppose the unitary connection A on V is given by $A = \Gamma + a$, with $\|a\|_{L^\infty_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega)} \leq \|F_A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$. Suppose $\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M$, for some positive constant M. Then for all $1 \leq p < \infty$, there is a constant $C = C(n,p,M)$ such the following holds: for any $u \in L^p_2(\Omega,\partial\Omega;V)$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}M^{-1}$,*

$$\|\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon\|\nabla^2_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + C\varepsilon^{-1}\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{7.28}$$

Proof. From [35, Theorem 7.27] (see the last inequality in the proof of Theorem 7.27 on [35, p. 172]) we have the interpolation inequality

$$\|\nabla_\Gamma\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega')} \leq c(\varepsilon\|\nabla_\Gamma^2\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega')} + \varepsilon^{-1}\|\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega')}), \tag{7.29}$$

for some constant $c(n,p)$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$. Observe that

$$\nabla_A^2 u = \nabla_\Gamma^2 u + a\otimes\nabla_\Gamma u + (\nabla_\Gamma a + a\otimes a)\otimes u. \tag{7.30}$$

The interpolation inequality (7.29) and the identity (7.30) now yield an interpolation inequality for $\nabla_A u$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} &\leq \|\nabla_\Gamma u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \varepsilon\|\nabla_\Gamma^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + (1+\varepsilon^{-1})\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by (7.29))} \\
&\leq \varepsilon\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \varepsilon\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla_\Gamma u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \left(\varepsilon(\|\nabla_\Gamma a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2) + (1+\varepsilon^{-1})\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \varepsilon\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \varepsilon\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \left(\varepsilon(\|\nabla_\Gamma a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}) + 2\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2) + (1+\varepsilon^{-1})\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, for $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}\|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{-1}$, rearrangement yields

$$\|\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq 2\varepsilon\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + C\varepsilon^{-1}\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where C depends on $\|a\|_{L^\infty_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega)}$. Replacing ε by $\varepsilon/2$ and using $\|a\|_{L^\infty_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega)} \leq c\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ yields the conclusion. □

Modulo Proposition 7.10 and Corollary 7.11 below, we can complete the proof of Theorem 7.1:

Proof of Theorem 7.1, given Proposition 7.10 and Corollary 7.11. According to Theorem 7.5 there is a unique solution $h \in L^p_{2,A}(\Omega)$ to the Dirichlet problem

$$D_A D_A^* h = 0 \text{ on } \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad h = \psi \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

We can estimate the $C^0 \cap L^2_{2,A}(\Omega')$ norm of h in terms of $\|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ using [18, Theorem 1.1], since $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega(2r_0, r_1/2)$, A is Yang-Mills with L^2-small curvature, and g obeys the bounded geometry conditions of [18, §1.4]. We can therefore estimate the $C^0 \cap L^2_{2,A}(\Omega')$ norm of h in terms of $\|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(\Omega)}$, using estimate (7.16). Thus

$$\psi - h \in L^p_2(\Omega, \partial\Omega; V),$$

and so Corollary 7.11 implies that

$$\|\nabla_A^2(\psi - h)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C\|D_A D_A^*(\psi - h)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} = C\|D_A D_A^*\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{7.31}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_A^2\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega')} &\le \|\nabla_A^2(\psi-h)\|_{L^p(\Omega')} + \|\nabla_A^2 h\|_{L^p(\Omega')}\\ &\le \|\nabla_A^2(\psi-h)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + c\|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \text{(by [18])}\\ &\le C(\|\nabla_A^2(\psi-h)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(\Omega)}) \quad \text{(by (7.16))}\\ &\le C(\|D_A D_A^*\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(\Omega)}) \quad \text{(by (7.31))}.\end{aligned}$$

But Lemma 7.9 implies that

$$\|\nabla_A(\psi-h)\|_{L^p(\Omega')} \le \varepsilon\|\nabla_A^2(\psi-h)\|_{L^p(\Omega')} + C\varepsilon^{-1}\|\psi-h\|_{L^p(\Omega')}$$

and so, because $\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega')} \le \|\nabla_A(\psi-h)\|_{L^p(\Omega')} + \|\nabla_A h\|_{L^p(\Omega')}$ and $p \le 2$, we obtain the $L^p_{2,A}$ estimate

$$\|\psi\|_{L^p_{2,A}(\Omega')} \le C(\|D_A D_A^*\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(\Omega)}).$$

This completes the proof. □

The use of Lemma 7.9 in the preceding proof is unnecessary when $p \le 2$, as we hypothesized, but it indicates the structure of the argument if this assumption were dropped (for example, if we had useful $L^p_2(\Omega')$ estimates for h when $2 < p < \infty$).

Thus we see that the key remaining ingredient in our argument is to prove the following systems analogue of Lemma 7.2:

Proposition 7.10. *Let M be a positive constant. Let $\Omega \Subset \mathbb{R}^4$ be a C^1 domain, where $\mathbb{R}^n$ has a C^∞ metric g of bounded geometry and injectivity radius ϱ, let $\mu_1(\Omega, g)$ be the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of the scalar Laplacian on Ω, and let $1 < p < \infty$. Assume Ω obeys an interior cone condition for a fixed cone $\mathcal{K}$. Let A be an $C^\infty(\Omega)$ spin^c connection on a Hermitian bundle $V|_\Omega$, where $V = V^+ \oplus V^-$ and $V^\pm \cong \Omega \times \mathbb{C}^4$. Suppose*

$$\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \quad \|\mathrm{Rm}_g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le M, \tag{7.32}$$

and that $A = \Gamma + a$, with

$$\|a\|_{L^\infty_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega)} \le c\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}, \tag{7.33}$$

where $c = c(M)$. Then there is a positive constant $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\mathcal{K}, M, p, \varrho, \mu_1)$ such that the following holds. For any $1 < p \le 2$ there is a constant $C = C(\mathcal{K}, M, p, \varrho, \mu_1)$ such that for all $u \in L^p_2(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{C}^r)$ we have

$$\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C\|\nabla_A^*\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{7.34}$$

Corollary 7.11. *Continue the hypotheses of Proposition 7.10 and, in addition require that*

$$\|F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \|\mathrm{Rm}_g\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \varepsilon, \tag{7.35}$$

Then there is a constant $C = C(\mathcal{K}, M, p, \varrho, \mu_1)$ such that for all $\psi \in L^p_2(\Omega, \partial\Omega; V)$,

$$\|\nabla_A^2\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C\|D_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{7.36}$$

Remark 7.12. For the domain $\Omega = \Omega(r_0, r_1)$ of interest, the dependence of $\mathcal{K}(\Omega)$ on the geometry of Ω is explained in the paragraph following the statement of Theorem 7.1, while the dependence of $\mu_1 = \mu_1(\Omega)$ on Ω is explained in Lemma 7.7 and Remark 7.8.

The refinement we give in Proposition 7.10 and Corollary 7.11 is crucial for our purposes because the dependence of the constant C in [35] on the domain Ω is often difficult to discern from the proofs in [35]. While we might fix $r_0 = 1$ and consider r_1 large in $\Omega(r_0, r_1)$, there is usually an implicit assumption in the arguments of [35, Chapters 7–9] that the domain Ω is bounded. So we cannot necessarily assume that $r_1 = \infty$ is allowed and thus infer that the constant C is independent of $r_1 \in (1, \infty)$. For this purpose, the simplest strategy is to take the following corollary of the *Calderon-Zygmund inequality* [35, Theorem 9.9] as our starting point — as do Gilbarg and Trudinger, for example, in their proof of [35, Theorem 9.14]:

Theorem 7.13 (Calderon-Zygmund)**.** [35, Corollary 9.10] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain, not necessarily bounded, where $\mathbb{R}^n$ has its standard metric and let $1 < p < \infty$. Then there is a constant $c(n,p)$ such that for all $u \in L^p_2(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{C})$,*

$$\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le c\|\Delta u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{7.37}$$

If $p = 2$, then $\|\nabla^2 u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|\Delta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$.

In particular, the constant $c(n,p)$ in inequality (7.37) is independent of Ω; thus we can establish the dependence of C on the radii of $\Omega(r_0, r_1)$ by perturbation from this special case.

Proof of Proposition 7.10. First observe that if $u = (u_1, \dots, u_r) \in L^p_2(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{C}^r)$, for some integer $r \ge 1$, then each $u_j \in L^p_2(\Omega, \partial\Omega; \mathbb{C}^r)$, $1 \le j \le r$, obeys the estimate (7.37) and so the same holds for u with ∇ now defined by the product connection, ∇_Γ, on $\Omega \times \mathbb{C}^r$ and the Levi-Civita connection on $T^*\mathbb{R}^n$ for the standard metric on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

To go from the standard metric δ^{ij} on $\mathbb{R}^n$ to a metric g^{ij} of bounded geometry on $\mathbb{R}^n$ we can invoke the standard argument of [35, Lemma 6.1 & Theorem 9.11] to pass from the metric δ^{ij} to a constant coefficient metric a^{ij} and then to the given metric g^{ij} to show that the bound (7.37) continues to hold when δ^{ij} is replaced by g^{ij}. Alternatively, we can more simply observe that the proof of the Calderon-Zygmund inequality [35, Equation (9.27)] allows the Laplacian Δ_g on $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to be defined by a Riemannian metric g^{ij} of bounded geometry, that is $C^2(\bar{\Omega})$-bounded curvature and injectivity radius bounded below by a fixed positive constant. (See [8, pp. 6–7] for the first Green's identity and [6] for the existence of the fundamental solution for the Laplacian Δ_g, both of which are used in [35] when $g^{ij} = \delta^{ij}$.) The constant $c(n,p)$ in inequality (7.37) is then simply replaced by $c(M,n,p)$, where M is an $L^\infty(\Omega)$ bound on the Riemannian curvature of the metric g.

Lastly, we need to replace the product connection Γ on $\Omega \times \mathbb{C}^r$ with the given connection on the Hermitian vector bundle $V|_\Omega \simeq \Omega \times \mathbb{C}^r$. Writing $A = \Gamma + a$, observe that, schematically,

$$\nabla_A^*\nabla_A u = \nabla_\Gamma^*\nabla_\Gamma u + a \otimes \nabla_\Gamma u + (\nabla_\Gamma a + a \otimes a) \otimes u. \tag{7.38}$$

The identities (7.30) and (7.38) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} &\le \|\nabla_\Gamma^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|\nabla_\Gamma u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + (\|\nabla_\Gamma a\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|a\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)})\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
&\le C(\|\nabla_\Gamma^*\nabla_\Gamma u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_\Gamma u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}) \\
&\le C(\|\nabla_A^*\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}).
\end{aligned}$$

So, using Lemma 7.9 and rearrangement we have

$$\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C(\|\nabla_A^*\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}). \tag{7.39}$$

Here, C now also depends on an upper bound for $\|a\|_{L^\infty_{1,\Gamma}(\Omega)}$.

It remains to argue that the term $\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}$ on the right-hand side of inequality (7.39) can be omitted. We first show

Claim 7.14. *Continue the hypotheses of Proposition 7.10. Assume* $|\Omega| = \mathrm{vol}_g(\Omega) < \infty$ *and* $n = 4$. *Then for any* $1 < p < \infty$, *there is a constant* $C = (\mathcal{K}, p, |\Omega|, M)$ *such that*

$$\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C(\|\nabla_A^*\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}), \tag{7.40}$$

Proof. We can assume $p \neq 2$ throughout the proof, as the result is immediate from inequality (7.39) in this case. If $1 < p < 2$ then Hölder's inequality gives

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le |\Omega|^{2p/(2-p)} \cdot \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{7.41}$$

and via inequality (7.39) we are done in this case.

Hence, assume $2 < p < \infty$ for the remainder of the proof and note that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le |\Omega|^{2p/(p-2)} \cdot \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{7.42}$$

From the interpolation inequality [35, Equation (7.10)], we have

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le \varepsilon\|u\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} + \varepsilon^{-\eta}\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{7.43}$$

where $\eta = p - 2 > 0$ and ε is any positive constant. Now the Sobolev embedding theorem [2, Theorem V.5.4], the interpolation inequality (7.28), and the finite-volume L^p estimate (7.42) yield

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)} &\le c(\mathcal{K}, p)(\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\nabla_A u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})\\ &\le c(\mathcal{K}, M, p)(\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)})\\ &\le c(\mathcal{K}, |\Omega|, M, p)(\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}).\end{aligned} \tag{7.44}$$

(The dependence of c on the cone $\mathcal{K}$ follows from the Sobolev embedding theorem; see [2, §IV.3 & Theorem V.5.4].) Choosing $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}c^{-1}$ in inequality (7.43), we can now combine the estimates (7.43), (7.44), and (7.39) and use rearrangement to give the desired result when $2 < p < \infty$. □

Our eigenvalue estimate (7.21) yields

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \mu_1^{-1}\|\nabla_A^*\nabla_A u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{7.45}$$

where $\mu_1 = \mu_1(\Omega; \nabla_A^*\nabla_A) \ge \mu_1(\Omega; \Delta) > 0$ (for any bounded C^1 domain Ω) and so, for $2 \le p < \infty$, inequalities (7.40) and (7.42) give the desired estimate (7.34) for $2 \le p < \infty$, namely

$$\|\nabla_A^2 u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C\|\nabla_A^*\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for } 2 \le p < \infty. \tag{7.46}$$

Note that for $2 \le p < \infty$, inequalities (7.43), (7.44), (7.45), (7.42), and (7.46) yield

$$\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C\|\nabla_A^*\nabla_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for } 2 \le p < \infty. \tag{7.47}$$

We use the preceding estimate to extend the bound (7.46) to $1 < p \leq 2$ by duality. The bound (7.47) is equivalent to

$$\|G_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}, \quad \text{for } 2 \leq p < \infty, \tag{7.48}$$

where $G_A = (\nabla_A^* \nabla_A)^{-1}$ is the L^2-self-adjoint Dirichlet Green's operator.

For $1 < p \leq 2$, write $1 = 1/p + 1/p'$, with $2 \leq p' < \infty$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|G_A u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} &= \sup\{(G_A u, v)_{L^2(\Omega)} : \|v\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} = 1\} \\
&= \sup\{(u, G_A v)_{L^2(\Omega)} : \|v\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} = 1\} \\
&\leq \sup\{\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \|G_A v\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} : \|v\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} = 1\} \\
&\leq \|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \cdot \sup\{C\|v\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} : \|v\|_{L^{p'}(\Omega)} = 1\} \quad \text{(by (7.48))} \\
&= C\|u\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, inequalities (7.48) and thus (7.47) also hold for $1 < p \leq 2$ and so combining (7.47) with (7.39) yields the desired estimate (7.34) for $1 < p \leq 2$. □

Proof of Corollary 7.11. This follows by the Bochner formula $D_A^2 = \nabla_A^* \nabla_A + \mathcal{R}_A$ and the argument at the conclusion of the proof of Proposition 7.10, now using our L^2 hypothesis on $\mathcal{R}_A$ via (7.35) and the eigenvalue estimate (7.22) for D_A^2 in place of the ones (7.21), (7.45) for $\nabla_A^* \nabla_A$. □

8. Eigenvalue estimates for PU(2)-monopole Laplacians

We need to analyze the behavior of the small eigenvalues of the Laplacian $d_{A,\Phi}^1 d_{A,\Phi}^{1,*}$ on $L^2(X, \Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2(X, V^-)$ as the point $[A, \Phi]$ in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ converges, in the Uhlenbeck topology, to a point $([A_0, \Phi_0], \mathbf{x})$ in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell) \times \mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$, where $\mathfrak{t}$ is the spin^u structure (ρ, W^+, W^-, E) on (X, g) and $\mathfrak{t}_\ell = (\rho, W^+, W^-, E_\ell)$. Our derivation in [26] of the eigenvalue bounds for the Laplacian $d_{A,\Phi}^{0,*} d_{A,\Phi}^0$ on $L^2(X, \mathfrak{g}_E)$ is closely modelled on the arguments given here for the Laplacian $d_{A,\Phi}^1 d_{A,\Phi}^{1,*}$ on $L^2(X, \Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2(X, V^-)$.

Perhaps the earliest results of this type and those best known to geometric analysts are due to C. H. Taubes, for the anti-self-dual Laplacian $d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}$ [58], [60], and our basic method ultimately goes back to Taubes — though not the details, which are quite different for PU(2) monopoles and considerably more challenging. In [60, Lemma 4.8], Taubes describes the small eigenvalues of $d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}$, where A is an approximately anti-self-dual connection constructed by splicing $|\mathbf{x}| \leq \ell$ one-instantons onto the background product connection Γ. Analogous arguments are used by Mrowka in the proof of Theorem 6.1.0.0.4 [51] in order to establish his 'main eigenvalue estimate', though the eigenvalue estimates are more precise here in that we give both upper and lower bounds.

More recently, there has been work of S. Cappell, R. Lee, and E. Y. Miller [7], who considered the effect of cut-and-paste and stretching constructions on the eigenvalues of a first-order, self-adjoint, elliptic operator on a closed n-manifold containing a long tube. This generalizes the situation of [51] somewhat, so it is of interest to summarize their main result at this point. To set notation, temporarily let X be a closed smooth n-manifold, $Y \subset X$ a separating, codimension-one submanifold decomposing X as $X = X_1 \cup_Y X_2$. Let D be some first-order, elliptic self-adjoint operator on X of "Atiyah-Patodi-Singer type" on a neighborhood $[-1,1]\times Y$ of Y; thus (1) $D=\sigma(\partial/\partial t+\widehat{D})$ in this neighborhood. Let $X(T)$ denote the manifold obtained by replacing the neighborhood of Y by $[-T,T]\times Y$. The operator D has a natural extension to $X(T)$ using (1) to define D on the neighborhood of Y. Define $X_1(T)=X_1\cup([0,T]\times Y)$, $X_1(\infty)=X_1\cup([0,\infty)\times Y)$; note that D determines an operator on $X_1(T)$ and $X_1(\infty)$ using (1) again. Similarly define $X_2(T)$ and $X_2(\infty)$.

The results of this [7] concern constructing eigenvectors with low eigenvalues of D on $X(T)$ in terms of corresponding eigenvectors of D on $X_i(T)$ and L^2 eigenvectors of D on $X_i(\infty)$.

The main theorem of [7] roughly states that for T large enough, the eigenvectors of D on $X(T)$ whose eigenvalues lie in $(-T^{3/2+\epsilon},T^{3/2+\epsilon})$ can be approximated by splicing together L^2 eigenvectors on $X_1(\infty)$ and $X_2(\infty)$. (If the kernel of $\widehat{D}$ is non-empty, one needs also to "splice in" certain extended L^2 solutions to $Du=0$ on $X_i(\infty)$.) Moreover, any eigenvalue in the range $(-T^{3/2+\epsilon},T^{3/2+\epsilon})$ actually lies in the range $(-\exp(cT),\exp(cT))$ for some $c>0$; that is, "small eigenvalues are exponentially small in T".

In the present article, our main application of the eigenvalue bounds of this section will be to deriving an estimate for the partial right inverse $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}=d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi})^{-1}\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ for $d^1_{A,\Phi}$, as given in Corollary 9.3. Our estimates on L^2-orthogonal projections of approximate eigenvectors will play an important role in [26] in our proofs of injectivity and surjectivity of the gluing maps and of Uhlenbeck continuity of the gluing maps.

In the next definition we collect some of the key technical properties we shall require of the pairs (A,Φ) so we can describe the small-eigenvalue behavior of the Laplacians of interest in this section. While our main eigenvalue estimate, Theorem 8.3, is only applied in this paper to the case where (A,Φ) is a spliced pair, it is perhaps useful to try to isolate the minimal properties we actually need.

Definition 8.1. Let (X,g) be a closed, oriented four-manifold with Riemannian metric g. Let E_ℓ be a Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle over X, let (ρ,W^+,W^-) be a spin^c structure on X, and set $V_\ell=W\otimes E_\ell$, and $V_\ell^{\pm}=W^{\pm}\otimes E_\ell$. Write $\mathfrak{t}_\ell=(\rho,W^+,W^-,E_\ell)$. Let $\ell\geq 1$ be an integer and suppose $(A_0,\Phi_0,\mathbf{x})$ is an L^2_k representative on $(\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell},V_\ell^+)$ of a point in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)\times\operatorname{Sym}^\ell(X)$, with $k\geq 4$. Let $\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0]$ be the least positive eigenvalue of the Laplacian $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ on $L^2(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})\oplus L^2(V_\ell^-)$. Suppose C and $\lambda_0\leq 1$ are positive constants depending at most on g and the maximum of $\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2_{k-1,A_0}(X)}$, $\|\Phi_0\|_{L^2_{k,A_0}(X)}$, $\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0]$, $\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0]^{-1}$, $\dim\operatorname{Ker}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$, and ℓ.

For $m=|\mathbf{x}|$ and $\lambda_p\in(0,\lambda_0]$, $1\leq p\leq m$, define a precompact open subset $U_0\Subset X\setminus\mathbf{x}$ and balls surrounding the points $x\in\mathbf{x}$ by setting

$$U_0=X-\bigcup_{p=1}^{m}\bar{B}(x_p,4\lambda_p^{1/3})\quad\text{and}\quad B_p=B(x_p,\lambda_p^{1/3}/4),\quad 1\leq p\leq m. \tag{8.1}$$

Let E be a Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle over X with $\det E=\det E_\ell$ and $c_2(E)=c_2(E_\ell)+\ell$. Write $\mathfrak{t}=(\rho,W^+,W^-,E)$. Denote $V=W\otimes E$ and $V^{\pm}=W^{\pm}\otimes E$. Let $\kappa_p\geq 1$ denote the multiplicities of the points $x_p\in\mathbf{x}$, so $\sum_{p=1}^m\kappa_p=\ell$. Fix an isomorphism $E|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}}\cong E_\ell|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}}$. For $\lambda=\max_{1\leq p\leq m}\lambda_p$, we say that an L^2_k pair (A,Φ) on $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V^+)$, representing a point in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$, is *$\lambda$-close* to the ideal triple $(A_0,\Phi_0,\mathbf{x})$ on $(\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell},V_\ell^+)$ if the following hold:

$$\|(A,\Phi)-(A_0,\Phi_0)\|_{L^2_{1,A_0}(U_0)} \le C\lambda^{1/3}, \tag{8.2}$$

$$\big|\|F_A\|_{L^2(B_p)}-(8\pi^2\kappa_p)^{1/2}\big| \le 1/100, \quad 1\le p\le m, \tag{8.3}$$

$$\|F_A^{+,g}\|_{L^2(B_p)} \le C\lambda^{1/3}, \quad 1\le p\le m, \tag{8.4}$$

$$\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(X)} \le C, \tag{8.5}$$

$$\Phi = 0 \quad \text{on } B_p. \tag{8.6}$$

Remark 8.2. Throughout this section, the constant C may be allowed to increase or the constant λ_0 may be allowed to decrease from line to line. However, their dependencies will remain as stated in Definition 8.1. As always, we use c to denote a constant which depends at most on the Riemannian metric of X, but is otherwise universal.

We remark that if $[A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha]$ is a sequence of points in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ which converges to $[A_0,\Phi_0,\mathbf{x}]$ in the Uhlenbeck topology [29, Definition 4.19], then, after passing to a subsequence, there is a sequence of $L^2_{k+1,\mathrm{loc}}(X\setminus\mathbf{x})$ bundle isomorphisms $u_\alpha: E|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}}\to E_\ell|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}}$ and a constant α_0 such that for all $\alpha\ge\alpha_0(\lambda)$, the pairs $u_\alpha(A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha)$ obey the condition (8.2). If $[A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha]$ is a sequence of PU(2) monopoles, then the proof of Theorem 4.20 in [29] implies that the pairs $u_\alpha(A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha)$ also obey conditions (8.3), (8.4), and (8.5).

Proposition 5.5 (and its proof) ensures that conditions (8.3) and (8.4) are obeyed by the approximate, extended PU(2) monopoles produced by splicing in §3. The condition (8.5) is also obeyed by such pairs, as one can easily see by definition (3.19). Though we require $\Phi\equiv 0$ on each ball B_p in condition (8.6), this is really only used at one point in the argument, namely in the proof of Lemma 8.16 via the definition (8.32) of certain approximate eigenvectors. Condition (8.2) is trivially obeyed since, for a slightly different choice of U_0 (with balls $B(x_p,4\lambda_p^{1/3})$ replaced by $B(x_p,8\lambda_p^{1/3})$, we have $(A,\Phi)=(A_0,\Phi_0)$ on U_0.

Theorem 8.3. *Continue the notation of Definition 8.1. Suppose $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_0]$ and let (A,Φ) be an L^2_k pair on $(\mathfrak{g}_E,V)$ which is λ-close to the ideal pair $(A_0,\Phi_0,\mathbf{x})$. Assume that the kernel of $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ has dimension n and let $N=n+2\ell$. Let $\{\mu_l[A,\Phi]\}_{l\ge 1}$ denote the eigenvalues of the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ on $L^2(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(V^-)$, repeated according to their multiplicity and in ascending order. Then*

$$\mu_l[A,\Phi]\le\begin{cases} C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}, & \text{if } l=1,\dots,N,\\ K+C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}, & \text{if } l=N+1,\end{cases}$$

$$\mu_l[A,\Phi]\ge K-C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}, \quad \text{if } l\ge N+1,$$

where

$$K=\min\{\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0],\nu_2[A_1],\dots,\nu_2[A_m]\}.$$

Corollary 8.4. *Let (X,g) be a closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold. Suppose $[A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha]$ is a sequence of points in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ which converges, in the Uhlenbeck topology, to a point $[A_0,\Phi_0,\mathbf{x}]\in\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)\times\mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$ and suppose the kernel of $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ has dimension n.*

Then the first $n+2\ell$ eigenvalues (counted with multiplicity) of $d^1_{A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha}d^{1,*}_{A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha}$ converge to zero, while the $(n+2\ell+1)$-st eigenvalue of $d^1_{A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha}d^{1,*}_{A_\alpha,\Phi_\alpha}$ converges to K, the minimum of the least positive eigenvalues of $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and $D_{A_p,g_p}D^*_{A_p,g_p}$, $1\le p\le m$.

The proof of Theorem 8.3 takes up the remainder of this section. Since the argument is fairly lengthy, it seems useful to outline the basic strategy. It is helpful to view of the proof as a linearized version of the proof of the gluing theorem for PU(2) monopoles:

- We establish upper bounds for the first $N+m+1$ eigenvalues of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ by constructing a set of approximately L^2-orthonormal, $N+m+1$ approximate eigenvectors via cutting off the first $n+1$ eigenvectors for $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and the first $2\kappa_p+1$ eigenvectors for each of the Dirac Laplacians $D_{A_p,g_p}D^*_{A_p,g_p}$, $1\le p\le m$. The error between the approximate eigenvectors and their L^2-orthogonal projections onto the small-eigenvalue eigenspace can also be estimated. This is the content of §8.2.
- In the reverse direction, we construct an approximately L^2-orthonormal basis for $\operatorname{Ker}(d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}\oplus\oplus_{p=1}^m D^*_{A_p,g_p})$ by cutting off the eigenvectors corresponding to the first N eigenvalues of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$. Again, we estimate the error between the approximate eigenvectors and their L^2-orthogonal projections onto the kernel. We use the resulting kernel basis to compute a lower bound for the $(N+1)$-st eigenvalue of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$. This is the content of §8.3 and §8.4.

8.1. **Technical preliminaries.** In this subsection we collect some preparatory results concerning estimates for eigenvectors, eigenvalue bounds, and decay estimates before proceeding to the different stages of the proof of Theorem 8.3.

8.1.1. *Induced metrics over the four-sphere.* The background metric g on X induces, by cutting off near the points $x_p\in X$, metrics on S^4 and $\mathbb{R}^4$ which are close to standard. We record here the precise cut-and-paste scheme, together with estimates of their deviation from the standard metrics. (See, for example [19, Definition 3.11 & Lemma 3.12].)

Define a cutoff function β_p on X so that $\beta_p=1$ on $B(x_p,\frac14\lambda_p^{1/3})$ and $\beta_p=0$ on $X-B(x_p,\frac12\lambda_p^{1/3})$. We define families of almost flat metrics δ_p on $\mathbb{R}^4=(TX)_{x_p}$, depending on the metric g on X, gluing site x_p, and scale λ_p, by setting

$$\delta_p := \begin{cases}\beta_p\delta+(1-\beta_p)\exp^*_{f_p}g & \text{on } B(0,\lambda_p^{1/3}/4),\\ \delta & \text{on } (TX)_{x_p}-B(0,\lambda_p^{1/3}/2),\end{cases} \tag{8.7}$$

where β_p is given by definition (3.17). Here, δ is simply the Euclidean metric on $(TX)_{x_p}$ defined by the metric g on TX, noting that $(\exp^*_{f_p}g)(0)=\delta$. We then obtain a family of conformally equivalent metrics g_p on $S^4=(TX)_{x_p}\cup\{\infty\}$ and rescaled metrics $\tilde g_p$ which are close to the standard metric g_0 by setting

$$h^*g_p(x)=\frac{4}{(1+|x|)^2}\delta_p(x),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^4, \tag{8.8}$$

$$h^*\tilde g_p(x)=\frac{4}{(1+|x|)^2}\delta_p(\lambda_p x),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^4, \tag{8.9}$$

where $h : \mathbb{R}^4 \to S^4 - \{s\}$ is inverse to stereographic projection. The definition of geodesic, normal (or 'Gaussian') coordinates implies that on a small ball around the points $x_p \in X$, the metric δ_p is C^1-close to g and that the difference between g and δ_p is C^2-bounded, uniformly with respect to the ball radius [6, Chapter 1], [58, Equations (8.8)–(8.12)]. If we only use normal, rather than geodesic normal coordinates, then the metric δ_p is only C^0 close to g.

Lemma 8.5. *Continue the above notation. Then $\tilde{g}_p$ converges to g_0 in $C^\infty(S^4 \setminus s)$ as λ_p converges to zero.*

8.1.2. *Induced connections over the four-sphere.* Similarly, connections over X induce connections on S^4: we shall need estimates for the self-dual component of the curvatures of these connections and the second Chern classes of the associated Hermitian vector bundles.

Fix an index $p \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, let ϱ be the injectivity radius of (X, g), and fix a constant $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{4}\varrho)$. Choose an orthogonal frame for $\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}|_{x_p}$ and use parallel translation via the connection A_0 along radial geodesics from $x_p \in X$ to trivialize $\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}$ over the ball $B(x_p, \varrho)$, so that $\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}|_{B(x_p,\varrho)} \to B(x_p, \varrho) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ is the resulting smooth bundle map. Let Γ denote the product connection on $B(x_p, \varrho) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$. We have $\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^\infty(X)} \le C$, for some positive constant C, and so $\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2(B(x_p,\delta))} \le C\delta^2$. Thus, we may suppose that δ is fixed small enough that Theorem 4.11 provides an SU(2) gauge transformation of $B(x_p, \delta) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ so that $a_0 = A_0|_{B(x_p,\delta)} - \Gamma$ (after relabeling) obeys

$$\|a_0\|_{L^4(B(x_p,\delta))} + \|\nabla_\Gamma a_0\|_{L^2(B(x_p,\delta))} \le c\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2(B(x_p,2\delta))}.$$

Our hypothesis (Definition 8.1) fixed an isomorphism $E|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}} \cong E_\ell|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}}$ and so the A_0-trivialization $\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}|_{B(x_p,\varrho)} \cong B(x_p, \varrho) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ induces an isomorphism $\mathfrak{g}_E|_{X\setminus\mathbf{x}} \cong (B(x_p, \delta) \setminus \{x_p\}) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$. With respect to this trivialization, write $A = \Gamma + a_p$ over $B(x_p, \delta) \setminus \{x_p\}$, where $a_p \in \Omega^1(B(x_p, \delta)\setminus\{x_p\}, \mathfrak{su}(2))$. Let $\Omega_p = \Omega(x_p; \frac{1}{4}\lambda^{1/3}, \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{1/3})$ denote the open annulus $B(x_p, \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{1/3}) - \bar{B}(x_p, \frac{1}{4}\lambda^{1/3})$ in X and let $B_p = B(x_p, \frac{1}{2}\lambda^{1/3})$. Then, for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0)$, the condition (8.2) implies that A obeys

$$\|a_p - a_0\|_{L^4(\Omega_p)} + \|\nabla_{A_0}(a_p - a_0)\|_{L^2(\Omega_p)} \le C\lambda^{1/3}.$$

Since $\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^\infty(X)} \le C$, we have

$$\|a_0\|_{L^4(B_p)} + \|\nabla_\Gamma a_0\|_{L^2(B_p)} \le C\lambda^{1/3}, \tag{8.10}$$

and therefore

$$\|a_p\|_{L^4(\Omega_p)} + \|\nabla_\Gamma a_p\|_{L^2(\Omega_p)} \le C\lambda^{1/3}. \tag{8.11}$$

Let β_p be the cutoff function of §8.1.1 and let g_p be the Riemannian metric on S^4 which coincides with g on B_p (after identifying the point $x_p \in X$ with the north pole $n \in S^4$) and extends g_p outside $B(x_p, \lambda_p^{1/3}) = B(n, \lambda_p^{1/3})$ to give a smooth metric on S^4. Define an SO(3) bundle F^p over S^4 by setting

$$F^p := \begin{cases} \mathfrak{g}_E & \text{over } B_p, \\ S^4 \setminus \{n\} \times \mathfrak{su}(2) & \text{over } S^4 \setminus \{n\}, \end{cases}$$

where the identification of the SO(3) bundles $\mathfrak{g}_E$ and $S^4 \setminus \{n\} \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ over the annulus $B_p \setminus \{x_p\}$ is induced from the SO(3) bundle isomorphism $\mathfrak{g}_E|_{B_p\setminus\{n\}} \cong B_p \setminus \{n\} \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$

described in the preceding paragraphs. We cut off the connection A on $\mathfrak{g}_E$ over the annulus Ω_p and thus obtain an L^2_k connection A_p on the SO(3) bundle F^p over S^4 by setting

$$A_p := \begin{cases} A & \text{on } \mathfrak{g}_E|_{B(n,\frac{1}{4}\lambda_p^{1/3})}, \\ \Gamma + \beta_p a_p & \text{on } S^4 \setminus \{n\} \times \mathfrak{su}(2). \end{cases}$$

Our hypothesis (8.4) on the pair (A, Φ) implies that A obeys

$$\|F_A^+\|_{L^2(B_p)} \le C\lambda_p^{1/3}. \tag{8.12}$$

Since

$$F_{A_p}^+ = \beta_p F_A^+ + (d\beta_p \wedge a_p)^+ + \beta_p(\beta_p - 1)(a_p \wedge a_p)^+,$$

we see that

$$\|F_{A_p}^+\|_{L^2(S^4)} \le \|F_A^+\|_{L^2(B_p)} + \sqrt{2}\|d\beta_p\|_{L^4(X)}\|a_p\|_{L^4(\Omega_p)} + \sqrt{2}\|a_p\|^2_{L^4(\Omega_p)}.$$

and therefore the estimates (8.10), (8.11), and (8.12) imply that

$$\|F_{A_p}^+\|_{L^2(S^4)} \le C\lambda_p^{1/3}. \tag{8.13}$$

Similarly, as

$$F_{A_p} = \beta_p F_A + d\beta_p \wedge a_p + \beta_p(\beta_p - 1)a_p \wedge a_p,$$

we see that

$$\|F_{A_p} - F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega_p)} \le \|\nabla_\Gamma a_p\|_{L^2(\Omega_p)} + c\|a_p\|_{L^4(\Omega_p)} + \|a_p\|^2_{L^4(\Omega_p)},$$

and therefore, the estimates (8.10) and (8.11) yield

$$\|F_{A_p} - F_A\|_{L^2(\Omega_p)} \le C\lambda_p^{1/3}. \tag{8.14}$$

Since by $\|F_A\|^2_{L^2(B_p)} = 8\pi^2\kappa_p$ by condition (8.3), while $A_p = A$ on $B_p - \Omega_p$ and $A_p = \Gamma$ on $\mathbb{R}^4 - B_p$, we see that the error estimate (8.14) and the Chern-Weil formula imply that $-\frac{1}{4}p_1(F^p) = \kappa_p$. In particular, we can choose a Hermitian vector bundle E^p over S^4 with

$$\mathfrak{g}_{E^p} = F^p \quad \text{and} \quad \det E^p = S^4 \times \mathbb{C}, \tag{8.15}$$

and $c_2(E^p) = \kappa_p$.

8.1.3. *Estimates for small-eigenvalue eigenvectors of the* PU(2)*-monopole Laplacian.* Recall from [29, Equation (2.36)] that the first-order operator

$$d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi} : L^2_{k+1}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_{k+1}(V^-) \to L^2_k(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_k(V^+)$$

is the formal adjoint of $d^1_{A,\Phi}$ and is given by

$$d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}\begin{pmatrix} v \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d_A^* v + (\rho(\cdot)\Phi)^*\psi \\ D^*_{A,\vartheta}\psi - (\Phi \otimes (\cdot)^* + (\cdot) \otimes \Phi^*)^*_{00}(\tau\rho^{-1})^* v \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8.16}$$

The application of cut and paste techniques to the problem of estimating eigenvalues and eigenvectors is simplest when we have $C^0 \cap L^2_{2,A_0}$ estimates for eigenvectors of the Laplacian $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$: this is possible since the pair $[A_0, \Phi_0]$ varies in a family with strong Sobolev-norm bounds on the curvature F_{A_0} and the spinor Φ_0. By retracing the proof of Lemma 5.9 in [16], we can obtain an estimate with the mildest possible bounds on (F_{A_0}, Φ_0) — though such optimality is not strictly necessary. That *some* estimate should exist, with constant a polynomial in $\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2_{l,A_0}(X)}$ and $\|\Phi_0\|_{L^2_{l+1,A_0}(X)}$, is a consequence of standard elliptic theory and Uhlenbeck's local Coulomb-gauge fixing theorem [67]. Then, by reworking the proof of [20, Lemma 6.7], we easily obtain:

Lemma 8.6. *Let X be a C^∞, closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold. Then there is a constant c with the following significance. Let (A,Φ) be an L^2_4 pair on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V)$ over X. Let $(\eta,\psi) \in L^2_3(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_3(X,V^-)$ be an eigenvector of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ with eigenvalue $\mu[A,\Phi]$. Then*

$$\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^\infty(X)} + \|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2_{2,A}(X)} \le C[A,\Phi]\|\eta\|_{L^2(X)},$$

where $C[A,\Phi] := C([A,\Phi],\mu[A,\Phi])$ with $\mu=\mu[A,\Phi]$ in

$$C([A,\Phi],\mu) := c(1+\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(X)} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty_{1,A}})^4(1+\mu)(1+\sqrt{\mu}).$$

More generally, if (η,ψ) lies in the span of the eigenvectors of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ with eigenvalues less than or equal to a positive constant μ, then

$$\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^\infty(X)} + \|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2_{2,A}(X)} \le C([A,\Phi],\mu)\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2(X)}.$$

We shall also need uniform $L^2_{1,A}(X)$ estimates for η and $L^2_{1,A}(U)$ estimates for ψ, when (η,ψ) is an eigenvector of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ and $U \Subset X\setminus \mathbf{x}$, but in the more difficult case where we cannot assume $[A,\Phi]$ varies in a family for which $\|F_A\|_{L^2_{l,A}(X)}$ is uniformly bounded when $l>0$.

Lemma 8.7. *Let X be a C^∞, closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold. Then there is a positive constant c with the following significance. Suppose $[A,\Phi]$ obeys the conditions of Definition 8.1. Let $(\eta,\psi)\in L^2_{k-1}(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_{k-1}(X,V)$ be an eigenvector of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ with eigenvalue $\mu[A,\Phi]$. Then*

$$\|\eta\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} + \|\psi\|_{L^2_{2,A}(U)} \le C[A,\Phi]\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2(X)}, \tag{8.17}$$

$U = X - \cup_{p=1}^m B(x_p, c_p\lambda_p^{1/3})$, where the c_p are universal positive constants, $C([A,\Phi],\mu)$ is a polynomial in $\sqrt{\mu}$, where $\mu=\mu[A,\Phi]$, $\|F_A\|_{L^2(X)}$, $\|F_{A_0}\|_{L^2_{k-1,A_0}(X)}$, and $\|\Phi_0\|_{L^2_{k-1,A_0}(X)}$. More generally, if (η,ψ) lies in the span of the eigenvectors of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ with eigenvalues less than or equal to a positive constant μ, then

$$\|\eta\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} + \|\psi\|_{L^2_{2,A}(U)} \le C([A,\Phi],\mu)\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2(X)}. \tag{8.18}$$

Proof. For convenience, write $(a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)$. First consider the $L^2_{1,A}(X)$ estimate for the component η. Since $a = d^{+,*}_A\eta + (\cdot\Phi)^*\psi$ from equation (8.16), Lemma 6.4 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\eta\|_{L^2_{1,A}} &\le C(\|d^{+,*}_A\eta\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|_{L^2}) \quad \text{(by Lemma 6.4)}\\
&\le C(\|a\|_{L^2} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty}\|\psi\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|_{L^2}) \quad \text{(by Equation (8.16))}\\
&\le C(\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2} + \|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2})\\
&\le C\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use $\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2} = \sqrt{\mu[A,\Phi]}\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2}$ to obtain the last line above.

Second, we consider the $L^2_{1,A}(U)$ estimate for the component ψ. From the proof of Theorem 9.2 we have the estimates (9.29) and (9.31),

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi\|_{L^2_{2,A}(U)} &\leq C(\|D_A\phi\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|_{L^2_{1,A}} + \|\psi\|_{L^2}),\\ \|\phi\|_{L^2_{1,A}} &\leq C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)\|_{L^2} + \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2}).\end{aligned}$$

(Note that as we only seek an estimate for ψ on the subset $U \Subset X \setminus \mathbf{x}$, we do not necessarily require that $\Phi \equiv 0$ on the balls $B(x_p, c_p\lambda_p^{1/3})$, as we do in the proof of Theorem 9.2, where estimates for solutions to the linearized, extended PU(2)-monopole equations are needed over all of X.) Combining the preceding two estimates, noting that $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi) = \mu[A,\Phi]\cdot(\eta,\psi)$, and applying our $L^2_{1,A}(X)$ estimate for η gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi\|_{L^2_{2,A}(U)} &\leq C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2} + \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2} + \|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2})\\ &= C\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

8.1.4. *A positive lower bound for the first eigenvalue of the anti-self-dual Laplacian on the four-sphere.* We shall need a lower bound for the least positive eigenvalue of the Laplacian $d^+_A d^{+,*}_A$ on $L^2(S^4, \Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)$. If A is an anti-self-dual connection with respect to the standard round metric of radius one on S^4 (and thus scalar curvature 12), then the Bochner formula (6.2) for $d^+_A d^{+,*}_A$ gives

$$d^+_A d^{+,*}_A = \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^*_A\nabla_A + 2.$$

More generally, the method of proof of Lemma 8.12 yields the following estimate for the least eigenvalue of $d^+_A d^{+,*}_A$ on S^4.

Lemma 8.8. *Let K_1 be the norm of the Sobolev embedding $L^2_1(S^4) \to L^4(S^4)$. Then for all $0 < \varepsilon < K_1/100$ the following holds. Let S^4 have a metric g' which is L^2_2-close to the standard round metric g of radius one, so $\|g' - g\|_{L^2_2(S^4,g)} < \varepsilon/100$. Let E be a Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle over S^4 with $c_2(E) \geq 0$ and orthogonal connection A on $\mathfrak{g}_E$. If $\|F^+_A\|_{L^2(S^4)} < \varepsilon/100K_1$ then* $\operatorname{Ker} d^{+,*}_A = \{0\}$ *and the least positive eigenvalue of $d^+_A d^{+,*}_A$ obeys the lower bound*

$$\mu_1(S^4; d^+_A d^{+,*}_A) \geq 2 - \varepsilon.$$

Proof. First suppose $g' = g$. The equality in the assertion of the lemma follows from the fact that the scalar curvature of the round metric on the n-sphere S^n of radius 1 (and thus constant sectional curvature 1) is equal to $n(n-1)$ by [8, pp. 37 & 60] and so the Bochner formula (6.2) for the Laplacian gives

$$d^+_A d^{+,*}_A = \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^*_A\nabla_A + 2 + \tfrac{1}{2}\{F^+_A, \cdot\},$$

Hence, integrating by parts and applying Hölder's inequality, we see that

$$\|d^{+,*}_A v\|^2_{L^2} \geq \tfrac{1}{2}\|\nabla_A v\|^2_{L^2} + 2\|v\|^2_{L^2} - \tfrac{1}{2}\|F^+_A\|_{L^2}\|v\|^2_{L^4}.$$

By Lemma 6.1 we have $\|v\|_{L^4} \leq K_1\|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}}$, where K_1 is a universal constant, so

$$\begin{aligned}\|d^{+,*}_A v\|^2_{L^2} &\geq \tfrac{1}{2}(1 - K_1\|F^+_A\|_{L^2})\|\nabla_A v\|^2_{L^2} + (2 - \tfrac{1}{2}K_1\|F^+_A\|_{L^2})\|v\|^2_{L^2}\\ &\geq (2 - \tfrac{1}{2}K_1)\|F^+_A\|_{L^2})\|v\|^2_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

where the factor in the last inequality is positive if we choose $\varepsilon < 4/K_1$. This leads to a lower bound for the first eigenvalue $\mu_1(S^4; d_A^+ d_A^{+,*})$,

$$\mu_1(S^4; d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}) = \inf_{\|v\|_{L^2}=1} (d_A^+ d_A^{+,*} v, v)_{L^2} \geq 2 - \tfrac{1}{2} K_1 \|F_A^+\|_{L^2} > 0,$$

and $\operatorname{Ker} d_A^{+,*} = \{0\}$, as desired. The argument is very similar if the metric on S^4 is only L^2_2-close to the standard metric, with a slightly smaller choice of ε, as the Riemann curvature tensor of the Levi-Civita connection for g' is given by $\mathrm{Rm}_{g'} = \mathrm{Rm}_g + \mathrm{Rm}_{g'} - \mathrm{Rm}_g$ with $\|\mathrm{Rm}_{g'} - \mathrm{Rm}_g\|_{L^2_2(S^4,g)} \leq \varepsilon/100K_1$. □

8.1.5. *Small eigenvalues of the Dirac Laplacian.* We shall also need estimates for the small eigenvalues of the Dirac Laplacian $D_A D_A^*$ on $L^2(X, V^-)$. As the spectra of $D_A D_A^*$ and $D_A^* D_A$ coincide on the complements of their kernels, it suffices to consider the small (but non-zero) eigenvalues of $D_A^* D_A$ — for which we have a useful Bochner formula (6.3) involving only the component F_A^+ of F_A — rather than $D_A D_A^*$, whose Bochner formula (6.4) involves the component F_A^- of F_A. For this case, the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [20], which gives estimates for the small eigenvalues of $d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}$ on $L^2_{k-1}(X, \Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$, yields

Theorem 8.9. *Let M be a positive constant and let (X, g) be a closed, oriented, Riemannian four-manifold. Then there are positive constants $c = c(g)$, $C = C(g, M)$, and small enough $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(C)$ such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$, the following holds. Let E, E_ℓ be Hermitian, rank-two vector bundles over X with $\det E = \det E_\ell$, $c_2(E) = c_2(E_\ell) + \ell$, for some integer $\ell \geq 0$, and suppose $c_2(E) \leq M$. Suppose $\mathbf{x} \in \operatorname{Sym}^\ell(X)$ and define a precompact open subset of $X \setminus \mathbf{x}$ by setting $U := X - \cup_{x \in \mathbf{x}} \bar{B}(x, 4\sqrt{\lambda})$. Let A be a connection representing a point in the open subset of $\mathcal{B}_E(X)$ defined by the following constraints:*

- *$\|A - A_0\|_{L^2(U)} < c\sqrt{\lambda}$ and $\|A - A_0\|_{L^2_{1,A_0}(U)} < M$, (noting that $E|_{X \setminus \mathbf{x}} \cong E_\ell|_{X \setminus \mathbf{x}}$).*

Let $\nu_2[A_0]$ be the least positive eigenvalue *of the Laplacian $D_{A_0}^* D_{A_0}$ on $L^2(X, V_\ell^+)$ and suppose $\max\{\nu_2[A_0], \nu_2[A_0]^{-1}\} \leq M$. Assume that the kernel of $D_{A_0}^* D_{A_0}$ has dimension less than or equal to M. Let $\{\mu_i^+[A]\}_{i \geq 1}$ denote the* positive *eigenvalues, repeated according to their multiplicity, of the Laplacian $D_A^* D_A$ on $L^2(X, V^+)$. Then*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_A \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_{A_0},$$

and, furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i^+[A] &\leq \begin{cases} C\lambda, & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_{A_0}, \\ \nu_2[A_0] + C\sqrt{\lambda}, & \text{if } i = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_{A_0} + 1, \end{cases} \\ \mu_i^+[A] &\geq \nu_2[A_0] - C\sqrt{\lambda}, \quad \text{if } i \geq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_{A_0} + 1. \end{aligned} \tag{8.19}$$

Corollary 8.10. *Continue the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 8.9. Let $\{\mu_i^-[A]\}_{i \geq 1}$ denote the* positive *eigenvalues, repeated according to their multiplicity, of the Laplacian $D_A D_A^*$ on $L^2(X, V^-)$. Then,*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_A^* \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_{A_0}^* + \ell,$$

where $\ell = c_2(E) - c_2(E_\ell) \geq 0$ *and, furthermore,*

$$\mu_i^-[A] \leq \begin{cases} C\lambda, & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_{A_0}, \\ \nu_2[A_0] + C\sqrt{\lambda}, & \text{if } i = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_{A_0} + 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\mu_i^-[A] \geq \nu_2[A_0] - C\sqrt{\lambda}, \quad \text{if } i \geq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_{A_0} + 1.$$

Proof. We have the bound on $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_A^*$ because $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_A^* = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ker} D_A - \operatorname{Index}_{\mathbb{C}} D_A$ and as, due to excision [12, §7.1] and Lemma 8.12, we have $\operatorname{Index}_{\mathbb{C}} D_A = \operatorname{Index}_{\mathbb{C}} D_{A_0} - \ell$. By the remarks preceding the corollary, we have $\mu_i^-[A] = \mu_i^+[A]$ for all $i \geq 1$, since these eigenvalues are positive, so the result follows from Theorem 8.9. □

Remark 8.11. The small-eigenvalue estimates in Theorem 8.9 and Corollary 8.9 are required by the proof of Theorem 9.2. We need the spectral splitting in order to apply Theorem 1.1 in [18] and estimate negative spinors on X.

8.1.6. *A lower bound for the first positive eigenvalue of the Dirac Laplacian on the four-sphere.* We recall from the proof of Proposition 2.28 in [29] that the complex index of the Dirac operator $D_A : \Gamma(S^+ \otimes E) \to \Gamma(S^- \otimes E)$, where (ρ, S^+, S^-) is the standard spin structure on S^4 and E is a Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle with $c_2(E) = l = -\frac{1}{4}p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E) \geq 0$, is given by

$$\operatorname{Index}_{\mathbb{C}} D_A = \frac{1}{4}\left(p_1(\mathfrak{g}_E) + (c_1(W^+) + c_1(E))^2 - \sigma(S^4)\right) = -l. \tag{8.20}$$

Hence, assuming $\operatorname{Ker} D_A = \{0\}$, we have $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Ker} D_A^* = 2l$; the vanishing condition is guaranteed by the following lemma.

Lemma 8.12. *Let* K_1 *be the norm of the Sobolev embedding* $L_1^2(S^4) \to L^4(S^4)$*. Then for all* $0 < \varepsilon < K_1/100$ *the following holds. Let* S^4 *have a metric* g' *which is* L_2^2*-close to the standard metric* g*, so* $\|g' - g\|_{L_2^2(S^4,g)} < \varepsilon/100$*. Let* (ρ, S^+, S^-) *be the standard spin structure on* S^4 [56, §6.4] *and let* E *be a Hermitian, rank-two vector bundle over* S^4 *with* $c_2(E) \geq 0$ *and orthogonal connection* A *on* $\mathfrak{g}_E$*. Let* A_d*,* A_e *denote the unitary connections on the (trivial) lines bundles* $\det S^+$*,* $\det E$*. If*

$$\|F_A^+\|_{L^2(S^4)} + \|F_{A_d}^+\|_{L^2(S^4)} + \|F_{A_e}^+\|_{L^2(S^4)} < \varepsilon/100K_1,$$

then $\operatorname{Ker} D_A = \{0\}$*,* $\operatorname{Ker} D_A^*$ *has real dimension* $2c_2(E)$*, and the least positive eigenvalues of* $D_A^* D_A$ *and* $D_A D_A^*$ *obey the lower bound*

$$\mu_1(S^4; D_A D_A^*) = \mu_1(S^4; D_A^* D_A) \geq 3 - \varepsilon.$$

Proof. The equality in the assertion of the lemma follows from the fact that aside from zero eigenvalues, the spectra of the Laplacians $D_A D_A^*$ and $D_A^* D_A$ coincide [36, Lemma 1.6.5]. Thus we need only consider the least positive eigenvalue of $D_A^* D_A$. For clarity of exposition, assume first that $g' = g$ and that $F_{A_d}^+ = F_{A_e}^+ = 0$.

The scalar curvature of the round metric on the n-sphere S^n of radius 1 (and thus constant sectional curvature 1) is equal to $n(n-1)$ by [8, pp. 37 & 60] and so the Bochner formula for the Laplacian $D_A^* D_A$ [29, Lemma 4.1(a)] gives

$$D_A^* D_A = \nabla_A^* \nabla_A + 3 + \rho(F_A^+),$$

where A is viewed as a unitary connection on E (rather than an orthogonal connection on $\mathfrak{g}_E$). Hence, integrating by parts and applying Hölder's inequality, we see that

$$\|D_A\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \geq \|\nabla_A\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + 3\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 - \|F_A^+\|_{L^2}\|\phi\|_{L^4}^2.$$

By Lemma 6.1 we have $\|\phi\|_{L^4} \leq K_1\|\phi\|_{L^2_{1,A}}$, where K_1 is a universal constant, so

$$\begin{aligned}\|D_A\phi\|_{L^2}^2 &\geq (1 - K_1\|F_A^+\|_{L^2})\|\nabla_A\phi\|_{L^2}^2 + (3 - K_1\|F_A^+\|_{L^2})\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\geq (3 - K_1\|F_A^+\|_{L^2})\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows if we choose $\varepsilon \leq 1/K_1$. This leads to a lower bound for the first eigenvalue $\mu_1(S^4; D_A^*D_A)$,

$$\mu_1(S^4; D_A^*D_A) = \inf_{\|\phi\|_{L^2}=1}(D_A^*D_A\phi, \phi)_{L^2} \geq 3 - K_1\|F_A^+\|_{L^2} > 0,$$

and $\operatorname{Ker} D_A = \{0\}$, as desired. The argument is very similar if the metric on S^4 is only L^2_2-close to the standard metric or if $F_{A_d}^+ \neq 0$, $F_{A_e}^+ \neq 0$, with a slightly smaller choice of ε. □

8.1.7. *Pointwise decay estimates for harmonic spinors on the four-sphere.* It will also be useful to estimate the effect of cutting off harmonic spinors on the complement of small balls around the north pole where the curvature of the connection A_p is concentrated.

Lemma 8.13. *Let $K_2 \geq 1$ be a constant. Then there are constants $\varepsilon(K_2) > 0$ and, if $M > 0$ is constant, a constant $c(K_2, M)$ with the following significance. Let S^4 have a metric g equivalent to the standard round metric of radius one g_1, so $K_2^{-1}g_1 \leq g \leq K_2g_1$. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^4 \cong S^4 \setminus \{s\}$ be inverse stereographic projection, and let $B(r_0)$ denote the ball $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : r < r_0\}$, where $r = |x|$. Let A be an L^2_k unitary connection on a Hermitian bundle E over S^4, let (ρ, S^+, S^-) be the standard spin structure over S^4, and let $V = V^+ \oplus V^-$ with $V^\pm = S^\pm \otimes E$. Suppose A obeys*

$$\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(S^4 - h(B(1)),g)} \leq M \text{ and } \|F_A\|_{L^2(S^4 - h(B(r_0)),g)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Let $D_{A,g} : \Gamma(S^4, V) \to \Gamma(S^4, V)$ be the corresponding Dirac operator. Suppose $\psi \in L^2(S^4, V)$ obeys $D_{A,g}\psi = 0$. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^4 - B(2r_0)$ we have

$$|h^*\psi|(x) \leq c\varepsilon^{3/2}r_0(1 + r^{-3})\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4 - h(B(r_0)),g)}. \tag{8.21}$$

Furthermore, if $2r_0 \leq r_2 < \infty$,

$$\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4 - h(B(r_2)),g)} \leq \begin{cases} c\varepsilon^{3/2}r_0r_2^{-1}\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4 - h(B(r_0)),g)} & \text{if } r_2 \leq 1, \\ c\varepsilon^{3/2}r_0r_2^{-2}\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4 - h(B(r_0)),g)} & \text{if } r_2 \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{8.22}$$

Proof. We may suppose without loss that g is the standard round metric of radius one, so $(h^*g)_x = f^2|dx|^2$, where $f(x) = 2/(1 + |x|^2)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^4$, and $\delta_x = |dx|^2$ is the standard metric on $\mathbb{R}^4$. Let $\tilde{\psi} = f^{3/2} \cdot h^*\psi$ and recall that $D_{A,\delta} = f^{-5/2} \circ D_{A,g} \circ f^{3/2}$ [29, Remark 4.8], [45, Theorem II.5.4], and so $D_{A,\delta}\tilde{\psi} = 0$. Theorem 1.1 in [18] (with $r_1 = \infty$) implies that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^4 - B(2r_0)$, we have

$$|\tilde{\psi}|(x) \leq c\varepsilon^{3/2}r_0r^{-3}\|\tilde{\psi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_0),\delta)}. \tag{8.23}$$

Our first task is to show that $\|\tilde{\psi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_0),\delta)}$ is bounded by $c\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4 - h(B(r_0)),g)}$.

For $y \in \mathbb{R}^4 = S^4 \setminus \{n\}$ (say), we recall that $|\partial/\partial r|_\delta = 1$, while $|\partial/\partial r|_g = 2(1+r^2)^{-1}$. Thus,

$$\operatorname{dist}_g(h(y), s) = \int_0^{|y|} 2(1+t^2)^{-1}\,dt = \arctan(|y|) \le 2|y|.$$

Suppose $r_1 > 4r_0$, but fixed, and consider the region $\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_1)$. Observe that, as $dV_g = \sqrt{\det g}\,d^4x = f^4\,d^4x$ and, when $|x| \ge 1$ and setting $y = x^{-1}$ (identifying $\mathbb{R}^4$ with the quaternions), we have $f(x)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}(1+|x|^2) \le |x|^2 = |y|^{-2} \le \frac{1}{4}\operatorname{dist}_g(h(y), s)^{-2}$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\psi}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_1),\delta)} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_1)} |h^*\psi|^2 f^3\,d^4x \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_1/2)} |h^*\psi|^2 f^{-1}\sqrt{\det g}\,d^4x \\ &\le \sup_{p\in S^4} \int_{S^4 - h(B(r_1))} c\operatorname{dist}_g(\cdot, p)^{-2}|\psi|^2\,dV_g \\ &= \|\psi\|^2_{L^{2\sharp}(S^4 - h(B(r_1)),g)}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the embedding $L^2_1 \subset L^{2\sharp}$ [16, Lemma 4.1] implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\psi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_1),\delta)} &\le c\|\psi\|_{L^{2\sharp}(S^4 - h(B(r_1)),g)} \\ &\le c\|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(S^4 - h(B(r_1/2)),g)}.\end{aligned} \tag{8.24}$$

On $S^4 - h(B(r_1))$, where $\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(S^4 - h(B(r_1)),g)} \le M$ by hypothesis, we have the uniform elliptic estimate

$$\|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(S^4 - h(B(r_1/2)),g)} \le c(r_1)\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4 - h(B(r_1/4)),g)}, \tag{8.25}$$

via the Bochner formula for $D^2_{A,g}$, because $D_{A,g}\psi = 0$ on S^4. Combining the estimates (8.24) and (8.25) gives

$$\|\tilde{\psi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_1),\delta)} \le c(r_1)\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4 - h(B(r_1/4)),g)}. \tag{8.26}$$

Now consider the region $\Omega(r_0, r_1)$. The harmonic spinor ψ on S^4 obeys, for universal and fixed $r_1 \le 1$ (without loss), and all $r \in [r_0, r_1]$, the estimate

$$|\tilde{\psi}|(x) = f(x)^{3/2}|h^*\psi|(x) \le (2/(1+r_1^2))^{3/2}|h^*\psi|(x) \le 2\sqrt{2}|h^*\psi|(x).$$

In particular, using $dV_g = f^4\,d^4x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\psi}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega(r_0,r_1),\delta)} &= \int_{\Omega(r_0,r_1)} |\tilde{\psi}|^2\,d^4x \\ &= \int_{\Omega(r_0,r_1)} |f^{-3/2}\cdot\tilde{\psi}|^2 f^3\,dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega(r_0,r_1)} f^{-1}|h^*\psi|^2 f^4\,d^4x \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega(r_0,r_1)} (1+r^2)|h^*\psi|^2\,dV_g \\ &\le \|\psi\|^2_{L^2(h(\Omega(r_0,r_1)),g)},\end{aligned}$$

and thus, for all $0 \leq r_0 < r_1 \leq 1$,

$$\|\tilde{\psi}\|_{L^2(\Omega(r_0,r_1),\delta)} \leq \|\psi\|_{L^2(h(\Omega(r_0,r_1)),g)}. \tag{8.27}$$

Combining our $L^2(\mathbb{R}^4,\delta)$ estimate (8.26) for $\tilde{\psi}$ over $\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_1)$ and our estimate (8.27) over $\Omega(r_0,r_1)$ yields

$$\|\tilde{\psi}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4-B(r_0),\delta)} \leq c\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B(r_0)),g)}. \tag{8.28}$$

Hence, on S^4, using $h^*\psi = f^{-3/2}\cdot\tilde{\psi}$ and $r = |x| \in [2r_0,\infty)$ and our decay estimate (8.23) for $\tilde{\psi}$ on $\mathbb{R}^4 - B(2r_0)$, we obtain a decay estimate for ψ on $S^4 - h(B(2r_0))$,

$$\begin{aligned}|h^*\psi|(x) &\leq c\varepsilon^{3/2} r_0 r^{-3} f^{-3/2}\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B(r_0)),g)} \\ &\leq c\varepsilon^{3/2} r_0 r^{-3}(1+r^2)^{3/2}\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B(r_0)),g)}.\end{aligned}$$

This yields the pointwise bound (8.21).

Hence, for all $r_2 > 2r_0$ and setting $E = \|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B(r_0)),g)}$ for convenience, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi\|^2_{L^2(S^4-h(B(r_2)),g)} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4-B(r_2)} |h^*\psi|^2 f^4\, d^4x \\ &\leq c\varepsilon^3 r_0^2 \int_{r_2}^{\infty} r^{-6} f^{-3} E^2 f^4 r^3\, dr \\ &= c\varepsilon^3 r_0^2 E^2 \int_{r_2}^{\infty} r^{-3}(1+r^2)^{-1}\, dr \\ &= c\varepsilon^3 r_0^2 E^2 \left(r_2^{-2} - \log(1+r_2^{-2})\right).\end{aligned}$$

The result (8.22) follows. □

We note that the proof of the preceding lemma is much simpler in the case of harmonic spinors over $\mathbb{R}^4$:

Lemma 8.14. *There is a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ and, if $M > 0$, a constant $c(M)$ with the following significance. Let $\mathbb{R}^4$ have an asymptotically flat metric g (in the sense, for example, of* [18, Equation (1.9)]*). Let $h : \mathbb{R}^4 \cong S^4 \setminus \{s\}$ be inverse stereographic projection, and let $B(r_0)$ denote the ball $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 : r < r_0\}$, where $r = |x|$. Let A be an L^2_k unitary connection on a Hermitian bundle E over S^4 and denote its pullback to $\mathbb{R}^4$ via h also by A. Let (ρ, S^+, S^-) be the standard spin structure over $\mathbb{R}^4$, and let $V = V^+ \oplus V^-$ with $V^\pm = S^\pm \otimes h^*E$. Suppose A obeys*

$$\|F_A\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^4-B(1))} \leq M \text{ and } \|F_A\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4-B(r_0))} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Let $D_{A,g} : \Gamma(\mathbb{R}^4, V) \to \Gamma(\mathbb{R}^4, V)$ be the corresponding Dirac operator. Suppose $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^4, V)$ obeys $D_{A,g}\psi = 0$. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^4 - B(2r_0)$ we have

$$|\psi|(x) \leq c\varepsilon^{3/2} r_0 r^{-3}\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4-h(B(r_0)),g)}. \tag{8.29}$$

Furthermore, if $2r_0 \leq r_2 < \infty$,

$$\|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4-B(r_2))} \leq c\varepsilon^{3/2} r_0 r_2^{-1}\|\psi\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B(r_0)),g)}. \tag{8.30}$$

Proof. Inequality (8.29) follows from Theorem 1.1 in [18]. For the second estimate, observe that, setting $E = \|\psi\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_0))}$ for convenience, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_2))} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^4 - B(r_2)} |\psi|^2 \, d^4x \\ &\le c\varepsilon^3 r_0^2 E^2 \int_{r_2}^{\infty} r^{-6} r^3 \, dr = c\varepsilon^3 r_0^2 r_2^{-2} E^2.\end{aligned}$$

The result (8.30) follows. □

8.2. **An upper bound for the small eigenvalues.** We turn to the proof of the assertions of Theorem 8.3 concerning the upper bound for the small eigenvalues.

We define a cut-off function χ_0 on X which is equal to zero on the balls $B(x_p, 4\lambda_p^{1/3})$, and setting $\chi_0 = 1$ on $X - \cup_{p=1}^m B(x_p, 8L_p\lambda_p^{1/3})$ (see Lemma 5.4 for its definition). We recall that $\|d\chi_0\|_{L^4(X)} \le c(\log L)^{-3/4}$, where $L = \max_{1 \le p \le m} L_p$ and so, if we set $L_p = \lambda_p^{-1/6}$ for $1 \le p \le m$ we have $\|d\chi_0\|_{L^4(X)} \le c(-\log \lambda)^{-3/4}$ with $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Recall from Definition 8.1 that

$$U_0 := X - \bigcup_{p=1}^m \bar{B}(x_p, 4\lambda_p^{1/3}),$$

so $U_0 \Subset X \setminus \mathbf{x}$ and U_0 is the interior of $\operatorname{supp} \chi_0$.

Similarly, define cut-off functions χ_p, $1 \le p \le m$, on X which are equal to 1 on the balls $B(x_p, \frac{1}{8}L_p^{-1}\lambda_p^{1/3})$ and equal to zero on the complement of the balls $B(x_p, \frac{1}{4}\lambda_p^{1/3})$. As before, $\|d\chi_p\|_{L^4(X)} \le c(\log L)^{-3/4}$ and so, if $L_p = \lambda_p^{-1/6}$, we have $\|d\chi_p\|_{L^4(X)} \le c(-\log \lambda)^{-3/4}$ with $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

For the remainder of this section, we assume for simplicity that χ_0 is defined as in the preceding paragraph and observe that $\operatorname{supp} \chi_0 \Subset X \setminus \mathbf{x}$. Our main task in this subsection is to find an upper bound for the first $N + m + 1$ eigenvalues of $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$.

Proposition 8.15. *Continue the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 8.3. Let* $\nu_2[A_0, \Phi_0]$ *be the least positive eigenvalue of* $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ *and let* $\mu_1[A, \Phi] \le \cdots \le \mu_{N+m+1}[A, \Phi]$ *be the first* $N + m + 1$ *eigenvalues of* $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$. *Then there are positive constants* C *and* λ_0 *(see Remark 8.2) such that for all* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$, *the following holds:*

$$\mu_l[A, \Phi] \le \begin{cases} C(-\log \lambda)^{-3/2}, & \text{if } l = 1, \dots, N, \\ K + C(-\log \lambda)^{-3/4}, & \text{if } l = N + 1, \end{cases} \tag{8.31}$$

where $K = \min\{\nu_2[A_0, \Phi_0], \nu_2[A_1], \dots, \nu_2[A_m]\}$ *and* $\nu[A_p]$ *is the least positive eigenvalue of the Dirac Laplacian* $D_{A_p,g_p} D^*_{A_p,g_p}$ *on* $L^2(S^4, V_p^-)$, *with* A_p *and* g_p *the induced connection and Riemannian metric from* A *and* g *over* X *near the point* $p \in X$.

Before we begin the proof proper, let $\{(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset L^2(X, \Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}) \oplus L^2(X, V_\ell^-)$ be an L^2-orthonormal basis for $\operatorname{Ker} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and let $(\xi_{n+1}, \varphi_{n+1}) \in (\operatorname{Ker} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0})^\perp$ be an L^2 unit eigenvector corresponding to the least positive eigenvalue $\nu_2[A_0, \Phi_0]$ of $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$. Let $\{\varphi_{pi}\} \subset L^2(S^4, V_p^-)$ be an L^2-orthonormal basis for $\operatorname{Ker} D^*_{A_p,g_p}$, for $1 \le p \le m$ and

$1 \le i \le 2\kappa_p$; let $\varphi_{p,2\kappa_p+1} \in (\operatorname{Ker} D^*_{A_p,g_p})^\perp$ be L^2 unit eigenvectors corresponding to the least positive eigenvalue $\nu_2[A_p]$ of $D_{A_p,g_p}D^*_{A_p,g_p}$, $1 \le p \le m$. (We know from equation (8.15) that $c_2(E^p) = \kappa_p$ and from Lemma 8.12 that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Ker} D^*_{A_p,g_p} = 2\kappa_p$.) We begin by constructing a set of approximate eigenvectors, $\{(\xi'_{pi}, \varphi'_{pi})\}$, for the first $N+m+1$ eigenvalues of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$. The most natural choice is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\xi'_{0i}, \varphi'_{0i}) &:= (\chi_0\xi_i, \chi_0\varphi_i), \quad 1 \le i \le n+1, \\
(\xi'_{pi}, \varphi'_{pi}) &:= (0, \chi_p\varphi_{pi}), \quad 1 \le p \le m \text{ and } 1 \le i \le 2\kappa_p + 1,
\end{aligned}
\tag{8.32}
$$

recalling that $\sum_{p=1}^m \kappa_p = \ell$ by hypothesis.

When $p \neq 0$ one can see from equation (8.16) for $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ that this choice yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_{pi}, \varphi'_{pi}) &= \chi_p((\cdot\Phi)^*\varphi_{pi}, D^*_{A_p,g_p}\varphi_{pi}) + (0, \rho(d\chi_p)\varphi_{pi}) \\
&= (0, \chi_p D^*_{A_p,g_p}\varphi_{pi}) + (0, \rho(d\chi_p)\varphi_{pi}) \quad \text{on } B_p,
\end{aligned}
\tag{8.33}
$$

since the condition (8.6) on Φ and B_p implies that $\Phi \equiv 0$ on $\operatorname{supp}\chi_p$.

We can now proceed with the proof of Proposition 8.15.

Lemma 8.16. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$, the following hold:*

$$
\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_{0i}, \varphi'_{0i})\|_{L^2(X)} \le \begin{cases} C\lambda^{1/3}, & \textit{if } 1 \le i \le n, \\ \sqrt{\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0]} + C\lambda^{1/3}, & \textit{if } i = n+1, \end{cases}
\tag{8.34}
$$

$$
\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_{pi}, \varphi'_{pi})\|_{L^2(X)} \le \begin{cases} C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}, & \textit{if } 1 \le i \le 2\kappa_p, \\ \sqrt{\nu_2[A_p]} + C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}, & \textit{if } i = 2\kappa_p + 1. \end{cases}
\tag{8.35}
$$

Proof. To verify the first assertion in Lemma 8.16, note that $(\xi'_{0i}, \varphi'_{0i}) = \chi_0(\xi_i, \varphi_i)$ and so for $1 \le i \le n+1$ (schematically),

$$
\begin{aligned}
d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_{0i}, \varphi'_{0i}) &= \chi_0 d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi_i, \varphi_i) + d\chi_0 \otimes (\xi_i, \varphi_i) \\
&= \chi_0 d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\xi_i, \varphi_i) + d\chi_0 \otimes (\xi_i, \varphi_i) + \chi_0(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0) \otimes (\xi_i, \varphi_i).
\end{aligned}
\tag{8.36}
$$

For $1 \le p \le m$ and $1 \le i \le 2\kappa_p + 1$, equation (8.33) yields the corresponding expressions for $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_{pi}, \varphi'_{pi})$. Now

$$
\|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^2(X)} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 1 \le i \le n, \\ \sqrt{\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0]}\|(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^2(X)}, & \text{if } i = n+1. \end{cases}
\tag{8.37}
$$

$$
\|D^*_{A_p,g_p}\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^2(S^4)} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 1 \le i \le 2\kappa_p, \\ \sqrt{\nu_2[A_p]}\|\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^2(S^4)}, & \text{if } i = 2\kappa_p + 1. \end{cases}
\tag{8.38}
$$

By Lemma 5.4 (yielding $\|d\chi_0\|_{L^2} \leq c\lambda^{1/3}$), Lemma 8.6, and equation (8.36), we have for $p = 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq n+1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_{0i}, \varphi'_{0i})\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq (\|d\chi_0\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_0(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)\|_{L^2})\|(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^\infty} \\
&\quad + \|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^2} \quad \text{(by Equation (8.36))} \\
&\leq c\lambda^{1/3}\|(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^\infty} + \|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^2} \quad \text{(by Lemma 5.4 \& Inequality (8.2))} \\
&\leq C\lambda^{1/3}\|(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^2} + \|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^2} \quad \text{(by Lemma 8.6).}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the first assertion in Lemma 8.16 follows from the preceding inequality and the eigenvalue estimates (8.37).

For $1 \leq p \leq m$ and $1 \leq i \leq 2\kappa_p + 1$ and noting that φ_{pi} is an eigenvector of $D_{A_p,g_p}D^*_{A_p,g_p}$, so Theorem 1.2 in [18] applies,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_{pi}, \varphi'_{pi})\|_{L^2(X)} \\
&\leq \|d\chi_p\|_{L^2}\|\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^\infty(\operatorname{supp} d\chi_p)} + \|D^*_{A_p,g_p}\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)} \quad \text{(by Equation (8.33))} \\
&\leq c\lambda^{1/3}\|\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^\infty(\operatorname{supp} d\chi_p)} + \|D^*_{A_p,g_p}\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^2(S^4)} \quad \text{(by Lemma 5.4)} \\
&\leq C\lambda^{1/3}\|\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^2(S^4)} + \|D^*_{A_p,g_p}\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^2(S^4)},
\end{aligned}$$

with the last inequality following from [18, Theorem 1.2], giving the estimate for φ_{pi}. Therefore, the final assertion in Lemma 8.16 follows from the preceding inequality and the eigenvalue estimates (8.38). □

Remark 8.17. It is worth noting that if the Dirac operator D_{A_p,g_p} were replaced by D_{A_p,g_0}, where we use g_0 — the standard round metric on S^4 — rather than the approximately round metric g_p induced from g near $x_p \in X$, then our derivation of the estimate (8.35) would require a uniform $L^2_{1,A_p}(S^4)$ estimate for the negative eigenspinor φ_{pi}. However, as we discuss further in [18], such an estimate appears impossible to obtain due to the unfavorable structure of the Bochner formula (6.4).

Lemma 8.18. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$, the following holds:*

$$\left|((\xi'_{pi}, \varphi'_{pi}), (\xi'_{qj}, \varphi'_{qj}))_{L^2(X)} - \delta_{pq}\delta_{ij}\right| \leq \begin{cases} C\lambda^{4/3}, & \textit{if } p = q = 0 \textit{ and } 1 \leq i,j \leq n+1, \\ C\lambda^{4/3}, & \textit{if } p = q \neq 0 \textit{ and } 1 \leq i,j \leq 2\kappa_p + 1, \\ 0 & \textit{if } p \neq q. \end{cases} \tag{8.39}$$

Proof. Suppose $p = q = 0$ and $1 \leq i,j \leq n+1$. Using $(\xi'_{0i}, \varphi'_{0i}) = \chi_0(\xi_i, \varphi_i) = (\xi_i, \varphi_i) + (\chi_0 - 1)(\xi_i, \varphi_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
((\xi'_{0i}, \varphi'_{0i}), (\xi'_{0j}, \varphi'_{0j}))_{L^2(X)} &= ((\xi_i, \varphi_i), (\xi_j, \varphi_j))_{L^2(X)} + 2((\chi_0 - 1)(\xi_i, \varphi_i), (\xi_j, \varphi_j))_{L^2(X)} \\
&\quad + ((\chi_0 - 1)(\xi_i, \varphi_i), (\chi_0 - 1)(\xi_j, \varphi_j))_{L^2(X)}.
\end{aligned}$$

But $((\xi_i,\varphi_i),(\xi_j,\varphi_j))_{L^2(X)}=\delta_{ij}$, while the second two terms on the right above are bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|2((\chi_0-1)(\xi_i,\varphi_i),(\xi_j,\varphi_j))_{L^2(X)}+((\chi_0-1)(\xi_i,\varphi_i),(\chi_0-1)(\xi_j,\varphi_j))_{L^2(X)}\right|\\&\qquad\le c\lambda^{4/3}\|(\xi_i,\varphi_i)\|_{L^\infty}\|(\xi_j,\varphi_j)\|_{L^\infty}\le C\lambda^{4/3},\end{aligned}$$

courtesy of the definition of χ_0 (which implies that $\operatorname{Vol}(\operatorname{supp}(1-\chi_0))\le c\lambda^{4/3}$) and Lemma 8.6. This gives the conclusion when $p=q=0$.

The case $p\ne q$ follows from the fact that the supports of χ_p and χ_q are disjoint when $p\ne q$.

The assertion for $p=q\ne 0$ and $1\le i,j\le 2\kappa_p+1$ follows by the much the same argument as for $p=q=0$. Indeed, using $(\xi'_{pi},\varphi'_{pi})=(0,\chi_p\varphi_{pi})=(0,\varphi_{pi})+(0,(\chi_p-1)\varphi_{pi})$,

$$\begin{aligned}((\xi'_{pi},\varphi'_{pi}),(\xi'_{pj},\varphi'_{pj}))_{L^2(X)}&=(\varphi_{pi},\varphi_{pj})_{L^2(S^4)}+2((\chi_p-1)\varphi_{pi},\varphi_{pj})_{L^2(S^4)}\\&\quad+((\chi_p-1)\varphi_{pi},(\chi_p-1)\varphi_{pj})_{L^2(S^4)}.\end{aligned}$$

But $(\varphi_{pi},\varphi_{pj})_{L^2(S^4)}=\delta_{ij}$, while the remaining two terms on the right above are bounded by (see Lemma 8.13)

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|2((\chi_p-1)\varphi_{pi},\varphi_{pj})_{L^2(S^4)}+((\chi_p-1)\varphi_{pi},(\chi_p-1)\varphi_{pj})_{L^2(S^4)}\right|\\&\le 3\|\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B_p))}\|\varphi_{pj}\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B_p))}\\&\le c\lambda^{4/3}\|\varphi_{pi}\|_{L^2(S^4)}\|\varphi_{pj}\|_{L^2(S^4)}\quad\text{(by Lemma 8.13)}\\&\le c\lambda^{2/3},\end{aligned}$$

where $B_p=B(\frac{1}{4}\lambda_p^{1/3})$, noting that $1-\chi_p$ is supported on $S^4-h(B_p)$ and we applied Lemma 8.13 with $r_0=L\lambda_p$, for a constant $L\gg 1$, and $r_2=\frac{1}{4}\lambda_p^{1/3}\ll 1$, observing that $\|F_{A_p}\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B(L\lambda_p)))}\le\varepsilon$ and $\|F_{A_p}\|_{L^2(S^4-h(B(1)))}\le c\kappa_p$, by hypothesis of Theorem 8.3 on (A,Φ) and the definition of A_p on S^4. □

Proof of Proposition 8.15. Let $\{(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\}_{l=1}^{N+m+1}$ denote an ordering of the set of approximate eigenvectors $\{(\xi'_{pi},\varphi'_{pi}):0\le p\le m,1\le i\le n_p+1\}$, where $n_0=n$ and $n_p=2\kappa_p$ when $p\ge 1$. Now $\|(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2(X)}\ge 1-C\lambda^{2/3}$ by Lemma 8.18 and so the first and second assertions of Lemma 8.16 yield

$$\begin{aligned}\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2}&\le C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}(1-C\lambda^{2/3})^{-1}\|(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2}\\&\le C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\|(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2},\quad 1\le l\le N,\\\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}\xi'_{N+1}\|_{L^2}&\le\left(\sqrt{K}+C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\right)\|\xi'_{n+1}\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}\tag{8.40}$$

for small enough λ_0 and recalling that $K=\min\{\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0],\nu_2[A_1],\dots,\nu_2[A_m]\}$.

Let $F'_l:=[(\xi'_1,\varphi'_1),\dots,(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)]$ denote the span of the vectors $(\xi'_1,\varphi'_1),\dots,(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)$ in $L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(X,V^-)$ for $l=1,\dots,N+m+1$. By applying Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization to the basis $\{(\xi'_1,\varphi'_1),\dots,(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\}$ for F'_l, the estimates (8.40) imply that

$$\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2}\le\begin{cases}C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2}, & \text{if }(\eta,\psi)\in F'_N,\\\left(\sqrt{K}+C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\right)\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2}, & \text{if }(\eta,\psi)\in F'_{N+1}.\end{cases}\tag{8.41}$$

Recall from the statement of Theorem 8.3 that $\mu_1[A,\Phi] \leq \cdots \leq \mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi]$ are the first $N+1$ eigenvalues of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$; let (η_l,ψ_l), for $l=1,\dots,N+1$, be the corresponding L^2-orthonormal eigenvectors. Let F'_l denote the span of the eigenvectors $(\eta_1,\psi_1),\dots,(\eta_l,\psi_l)$ in $L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(X,V^-)$ and let $F_l^\perp$ be its L^2-orthogonal complement in $L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(X,V^-)$. Note that $\dim(F_l^\perp\cap F'_N)\geq N-l$. Then, for $l=1,\dots,N$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_l[A,\Phi] &= \inf_{(\eta,\psi)\in F_{l-1}^\perp}\frac{\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|^2_{L^2}}{\|(\eta,\psi)\|^2_{L^2}} \leq \inf_{(\eta,\psi)\in F_{l-1}^\perp\cap F'_N}\frac{\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|^2_{L^2}}{\|(\eta,\psi)\|^2_{L^2}}\\ &\leq C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/2},\end{aligned}$$

where we use the estimates (8.41) to obtain the final inequality above. This gives the first inequality in the stated eigenvalue bounds (8.31). Therefore, $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ has at least N eigenvalues which are less than or equal to $C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi] &= \inf_{(\eta,\psi)\in F_N^\perp}\frac{\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|^2_{L^2}}{\|(\eta,\psi)\|^2_{L^2}} \leq \inf_{(\eta,\psi)\in F_N^\perp\cap F'_{N+1}}\frac{\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta,\psi)\|^2_{L^2}}{\|(\eta,\psi)\|^2_{L^2}}\\ &\leq \left(\sqrt{K}+C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\right)^2 \leq K+C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4},\end{aligned}$$

where the estimates (8.41) yield the penultimate inequality above. This completes the proof of the second inequality in the eigenvalue bounds (8.31). □

8.3. **A map from the small-eigenvalue eigenspace to the direct sum of kernels.**

In this section we decompose the eigenspace spanned by the eigenvectors for the first N eigenvalues of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ and identify the decomposition with the kernels of the operators $d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and $D^*_{A_p,g_p}$, for $p=1,\dots,m$. For this purpose, we define a block-diagonal, first-order, linear elliptic operator

$$T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}} = d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}\oplus\bigoplus_{p=1}^m D^*_{A_p,g_p} \tag{8.42}$$

with domain and range, respectively, given by

$$\begin{gathered}\left(L^2_{k-1}(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})\oplus L^2_{k-1}(X,V^-_\ell)\right)\oplus\bigoplus_{p=1}^m L^2_{k-1}(S^4,V^-_p),\\ \left(L^2_{k-2}(X,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})\oplus L^2_{k-2}(X,V^+_\ell)\right)\oplus\bigoplus_{p=1}^m L^2_{k-2}(S^4,V^+_p).\end{gathered}$$

We shall construct an approximately L^2-orthonormal basis for $\operatorname{Ker}T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$ by cutting-off the eigenvectors corresponding to the first N eigenvalues of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$, estimating the error between the cut-off eigenvectors and their L^2-orthogonal projections onto $\operatorname{Ker}T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$ and then applying Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization to obtain an L^2-orthonormal basis.

Let Π_{A_0,Φ_0} be the L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})\oplus L^2(X,V^-_\ell)$ onto $\operatorname{Ker}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and let $\Pi^\perp_{A_0,\Phi_0}=1-\Pi_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ be the L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell})\oplus L^2(X,V^-_\ell)$ onto $(\operatorname{Ker}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0})^\perp=\operatorname{Ran}d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}$. Recall that Π_{A_p} is the L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(S^4, V_p^-)$ onto $\operatorname{Ker} D^*_{A_p,g_p}$ and let $\Pi^\perp_{A_p} = 1 - \Pi_{A_p}$ be the L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(X, V_\ell^-)$ onto $(\operatorname{Ker} D^*_{A_p,g_p})^\perp = \operatorname{Ran} D_{A_p,g_p}$.

Then the L^2-orthogonal projection from the domain of $T_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$ onto $\operatorname{Ker} T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$ is given by

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}} = \Pi_{A_0,\Phi_0} \oplus \bigoplus_{p=1}^m \Pi_{A_p}. \tag{8.43}$$

Recall from the proof of Proposition 8.15 that $\{(\eta_l, \psi_l) : 1 \leq l \leq N+1\}$ was defined to be the set of L^2-orthonormal eigenvectors associated with the eigenvalues $\mu_1[A,\Phi] \leq \cdots \leq \mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi]$ of $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$. We then obtain a set of $N+1$ approximate eigenvectors for $T_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$ by cutting off:

$$(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_l) = ((\chi_0\eta_l, \chi_0\psi_l), (0, \chi_1\psi_l), \dots, (0, \chi_m\psi_l)), \quad l = 1, \dots, N+1. \tag{8.44}$$

Our main goal in this subsection is to prove:

Proposition 8.19. *Continue the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 8.3. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$, the set $\{\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_l)\}_{l=1}^N$ is a basis for $\operatorname{Ker} T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$ and the following estimates hold:*

$$\|\Pi^\perp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_l)\|_{L^2} \leq C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq N, \tag{1}$$

$$\left|\left(\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_l), \Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_k)\right)_{L^2} - \delta_{kl}\right| \leq C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}, \quad 1 \leq k, l \leq N, \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})\|_{L^2} &\leq C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}, \\ \|\Pi^\perp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\eta'_{N+1}, \psi'_{N+1})\|_{L^2} &\geq 1 - C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The following estimates are the key to the proofs of Propositions 8.19 and 8.25.

Lemma 8.20. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$, the following hold:*

$$\|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0\eta_l, \chi_0\psi_l)\|_{L^{4/3}(X)} \leq C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\|(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^2(X)}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq N, \tag{8.45}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0\eta_{N+1}, \chi_0\psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(X)} &\leq \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)} \\ &\quad + C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\|(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(X)}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.46}$$

Proof. Observe that the definition (8.16) of $d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and writing $(A,\Phi) = (A_0,\Phi_0) + (A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)$ on $X \setminus \mathbf{x}$ implies that, schematically,

$$d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(v,\psi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) - \{(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0), (v,\psi)\},$$

and so (schematically) for $p = 0$ and $1 \leq l \leq N$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0\eta_l, \chi_0\psi_l) &= d\chi_0 \otimes (\eta_l, \psi_l) + \chi_0 d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l, \psi_l) \\ &\quad - \chi_0\{(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0), (\eta_l, \psi_l)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.47}$$

Observe that

$$\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^{4/3}} \leq c\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^2} = c\sqrt{\mu_l[A,\Phi]}\|(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^2}. \tag{8.48}$$

Thus, by the upper bounds for the eigenvalues $\mu_l[A,\Phi]$ in (8.31) (see Proposition 8.15) and Lemmas 5.4 and the identity (8.47), we have for $1 \leq l \leq N$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0\eta_l, \chi_0\psi_l)\|_{L^{4/3}} &\leq (\|d\chi_0\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_0(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)\|_{L^2})\|(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^4(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)} \\
&\quad + \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^{4/3}} \quad \text{(by Equation (8.47))} \\
&\leq C(\|d\chi_0\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_0(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{\mu_l[A,\Phi]})\|(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad \text{(by Inequality (8.48) and Lemma 8.7)} \\
&\leq C(\|d\chi_0\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_0(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)\|_{L^2} + \sqrt{\mu_l[A,\Phi]})\|(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\|(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the final bound follows from our hypothesis (8.2) on $(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)$, Lemma 5.4, and the small-eigenvalue upper bounds (8.31). This gives the $L^{4/3}$ estimate (8.45).

For the L^2 estimate (8.46), the identity (8.47) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0\eta_{N+1}, \chi_0\psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(X)} \\
&\leq \|d\chi_0\|_{L^4}\|(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^4(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)} \\
&\quad + \|(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)\|_{L^4(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)}\|(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^4(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)} \\
&\quad + \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)} \\
&\leq c(\|d\chi_0\|_{L^4} + \|(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)\|_{L^4(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)})\|(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)} \quad \text{(by Lemma 8.7)} \\
&\leq c((-\log\lambda)^{-3/4} + \lambda^{1/3})\|(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2} + \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from our hypothesis (8.2) on $\|(A - A_0, \Phi - \Phi_0)\|_{L^4(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)}$, and our estimates for $d\chi_0$. This completes the proof of Lemma 8.20. □

Lemma 8.21. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$, the following hold:*

$$\|D^*_{A_p,g,p}\chi_p\psi_l\|_{L^{4/3}(S^4)} \leq C\lambda^{1/3}\|(\eta_l, \psi_l)\|_{L^2(S^4)}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq N, \tag{8.49}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|D^*_{A_p,g,p}\chi_p\psi_{N+1}\|_{L^2(S^4)} &\leq \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)} \\
&\quad + C\lambda^{1/6}\|(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2(X)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.50}$$

Proof. Denote $(a_l, \phi_l) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l, \psi_l)$, for $1 \leq l \leq N + 1$. We have $(A, \Phi) = (A_p, 0) + (0, \Phi)$ on $\operatorname{supp}\chi_p \Subset S^4 \setminus \{s\}$ and so (schematically) the definition (8.16) of $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ implies that for $1 \leq l \leq N + 1$,

$$\phi_l = D^*_{A_p,g_p}\psi_l - \Phi \otimes \eta_l,$$

and so, using

$$D^*_{A_p,g_p}(\chi_p\psi_l) = d\chi_p \otimes \psi_l + \chi_p D^*_{A_p,g_p}\psi_l,$$

we see that (viewed equivalently either on X or S^4) for $1 \leq l \leq N + 1$,

$$D^*_{A_p,g_p}(\chi_p\psi_l) = d\chi_p \otimes \psi_l + \chi_p\phi_l + \chi_p\Phi \otimes \eta_l. \tag{8.51}$$

Thus, by the identity (8.51) and Hölder's inequality, we get for $1 \leq l \leq N$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|D^*_{A_p,g_p}(\chi_p\psi_l)\|_{L^{4/3}} \\
&\leq \|d\chi_p\|_{L^2}\|\psi_l\|_{L^4(\operatorname{supp} d\chi_p)} + \|\chi_p\Phi\|_{L^4}\|\eta_l\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)} + \|\chi_p\phi_l\|_{L^{4/3}} \\
&\leq (\|d\chi_p\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_p\Phi\|_{L^4})\|(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2(X)} + \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^{4/3}} \quad \text{(by Lemma 8.7)} \\
&\leq C\left(\|d\chi_p\|_{L^2} + \|\chi_p\Phi\|_{L^4} + c(\operatorname{Vol} B_p)^{1/4}\sqrt{\mu_l[A,\Phi]}\right)\|(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2(X)} \\
&\quad \text{(by Lemma 8.7 \& Inequality (8.48))} \\
&\leq C\lambda^{1/3}(1 + (-\log\lambda)^{-3/4})\|(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the definition of χ_p, our hypothesis (8.2) on $\Phi|_{B_p}$, and the upper bounds (8.31) for $\mu_l[A,\Phi]$. This establishes the $L^{4/3}$ estimate (8.49) for $1 \leq l \leq N$.

We turn to the proof of the estimate (8.50). This time, for $l = N+1$, the identity (8.51) and Hölder's inequality and the fact that $(a_l,\phi_l) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l,\psi_l)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|D^*_{A_p,g_p}(\chi_p\psi_l)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \|d\chi_p\|_{L^{8/3}}\|\psi_l\|_{L^8(\operatorname{supp} d\chi_p)} + \|\chi_p\Phi\|_{L^4}\|\eta_l\|_{L^4(\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)} + \|\chi_p\phi_l\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq (\|d\chi_p\|_{L^{8/3}} + \|\chi_p\Phi\|_{L^4})\|(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2(X)} + \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)} \quad \text{(by Lemma 8.7)} \\
&\leq C\left(\lambda^{1/6} + \lambda^{1/3}\right)\|(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2} + \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the definition of χ_p and our hypothesis (8.2) on $\Phi|_{B_p}$. This establishes the L^2 estimate (8.50) and completes the proof of Lemma 8.21. □

Note again that the derivation of the estimates (8.49) and (8.50) would be difficult or impossible to obtain if the Dirac operator D_{A_p,g_p} were replaced by D_{A_p,g_0}, using g_0 — the standard round metric on S^4 — rather than the approximately round metric g_p induced from g near $x_p \in X$ (see Remark 8.17).

We consider the problem of estimating the orthogonal projection errors:

Lemma 8.22. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_0]$, the following holds:*

$$\|\Pi^\perp_{A_0,\Phi_0}\chi_0(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2(X)} \leq C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\|(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2(X)}, \quad 1 \leq l \leq N. \tag{8.52}$$

Proof. We need to estimate $\Pi^\perp_{A_0,\Phi_0}\chi_0(\eta_l,\psi_l)$, for $1 \leq l \leq N$, where (η_l,ψ_l) are orthonormal eigenvectors corresponding to the first $N+1$ eigenvalues of the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ and Π_{A_0,Φ_0} is L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}) \oplus L^2(X,V^-_\ell)$ onto $\operatorname{Ker} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$. Since $\operatorname{Ker} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ is a closed subspace and $(\operatorname{Ker} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0})^\perp = \operatorname{Ran} d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}$, there is a unique $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}(a_l,\phi_l) \in \operatorname{Ran} d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0} \subset L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_{E_\ell}) \oplus L^2(X,V^-_\ell)$ such that

$$\Pi^\perp_{A_0,\Phi_0}\chi_0(\eta_l,\psi_l) = d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}(a_l,\phi_l) = \frac{(\chi_0(\eta_l,\psi_l), d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}(a_l,\phi_l))_{L^2}}{\|d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}(a_l,\phi_l)\|^2_{L^2}} d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}(a_l,\phi_l).$$

Hence, integrating by parts, we see that

$$\|\Pi^{\perp}_{A_0,\Phi_0}\chi_0(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2} \le \|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0(\eta_l,\psi_l))\|_{L^{4/3}} \frac{\|(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^4}}{\|d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^2}}.$$

We may suppose without loss that $(a_l,\phi_l) \in (\operatorname{Ker} d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0})^{\perp} = \operatorname{Ran} d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and therefore we can take $(a_l,\phi_l) = d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(v_l,s_l)$. Standard elliptic estimates for the Laplacian $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ then give

$$\begin{aligned}\|(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^4} &\le c\|(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^2_{1,A_0}} \le C\|(v_l,s_l)\|_{L^2_{2,A_0}} \quad \text{(by Lemma 6.1)}\\ &\le C(\|d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(v_l,s_l)\|_{L^2} + \|(v_l,s_l)\|_{L^2})\\ &\le C(1+\mu_1[A_0,\Phi_0]^{-1})\|d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(v_l,s_l)\|_{L^2}\\ &= C\|d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, combining the preceding estimates, we see

$$\|\Pi^{\perp}_{A_0,\Phi_0}\chi_0(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2} \le c\|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0(\eta_l,\psi_l))\|_{L^{4/3}}.$$

The preceding estimate, together with inequality (8.45), therefore yields estimate (8.52) for $l = 1,\dots,N$, and completes the proof of Lemma 8.22. □

Lemma 8.23. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_0]$, the following holds:*

$$\|\Pi^{\perp}_{A_p}\chi_p\psi_l\|_{L^2(S^4)} \le C\lambda^{1/3}\|(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^2(X)}, \quad 1 \le l \le N. \tag{8.53}$$

Proof. We need to estimate $\Pi^{\perp}_{A_p}\chi_p\psi_l$, for $1 \le l \le N$, where (η_l,ψ_l) are orthonormal eigenvectors corresponding to the first $N+1$ eigenvalues of the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ and Π_{A_p} is L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(S^4,V^-_p)$ onto $\operatorname{Ker} D^*_{A_p,g_p}$. Since $\operatorname{Ker} D^*_{A_p,g_p}$ is a closed subspace and $(\operatorname{Ker} D^*_{A_p,g_p})^{\perp} = \operatorname{Ran} D_{A_p,g_p}$, there is a unique $D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl} \in \operatorname{Ran} D_{A_p,g_p} \subset L^2(S^4,V^-_p)$ such that

$$\Pi^{\perp}_{A_p}\chi_p\psi_l = D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl} = \frac{(\chi_p\psi_l, D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl})_{L^2}}{\|D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl}\|^2_{L^2}} D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl}.$$

Hence, integrating by parts, we see that

$$\|\Pi^{\perp}_{A_p}\chi_p\psi_l\|_{L^2} \le \|D^*_{A_p,g_p}(\chi_p\psi_l)\|_{L^{4/3}} \frac{\|\phi_{pl}\|_{L^4}}{\|D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl}\|_{L^2}}.$$

On the other hand, we can bound $\|\phi_{pl}\|_{L^4}$ via

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi_{pl}\|_{L^4} &\le c\|\phi_{pl}\|_{L^2_{1,A_p}} \quad \text{(by Lemma 6.1)}\\ &\le C(\|D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl}\|_{L^2} + \|\phi_{pl}\|_{L^2}) \quad \text{(by Lemma 6.8)}\\ &\le C(1+\nu_2[A_p]^{-1})\|D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl}\|_{L^2} \le C\|D_{A_p,g_p}\phi_{pl}\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

the final inequality following from Lemma 8.12 (together with our hypothesis that $\|F_{A_p}^{+,g_p}\|_{L^2(S^4)}$ is small). Hence, combining the preceding estimates, we see

$$\|\Pi_{A_p}^{\perp}\chi_p\psi_l\|_{L^2} \le c\|D_{A_p,g_p}^*(\chi_p\psi_l)\|_{L^{4/3}}.$$

The preceding estimate, together with inequality (8.49), yields estimate (8.53) for $l = 1,\dots,N$, and proves Lemma 8.23. ☐

Proof of Assertion (1) in Proposition 8.19. Combining Lemmas 8.22 and 8.23 proves the first assertion of Proposition 8.19. ☐

We now turn to the remaining orthogonality assertions in Proposition 8.19.

Lemma 8.24. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_0]$, the following hold:*

$$\left|((\boldsymbol{\eta}_l',\boldsymbol{\psi}_l'),(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k',\boldsymbol{\psi}_k'))_{L^2} - \delta_{kl}\right| \le C\lambda^{2/3}, \quad 1 \le k,l \le N+1. \tag{8.54}$$

Proof. From (8.44) we see that we can write

$$\begin{aligned}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_l',\boldsymbol{\psi}_l') &= ((\chi_0\eta_l,\chi_0\psi_l),(0,\chi_1\psi_l),\dots,(0,\chi_m\psi_l))\\ &= ((\eta_l,\psi_l)_{B_0},(\eta_l,\psi_l)_{B_1},\dots,(\eta_l,\psi_l)_{B_m})\\ &\quad + ((1-\chi_0)(\eta_l,\psi_l)_{B_0},(-\eta_l,(1-\chi_1)\psi_l)_{B_1},\dots,(-\eta_l,(1-\chi_m)\psi_l)_{B_m}).\end{aligned}$$

Here, we write $X = U_0 \cup \cup_{p=1}^m B_p$ (for simplicity — the constants defining U_0 in (8.1) differ only by universal factors), with $U_0 = \operatorname{supp}\chi_0$ and $(\eta_l,\psi_l)_{B_p}$ denotes the restriction of (η_l,ψ_l) from X to B_p. Remark that the cutoff functions χ_p are chosen so that $d\chi_p$ is supported on annuli of the form $(c_-\lambda^{1/3}, c_+\lambda^p)$, where $0 < p \le 1/3$ and the annulus surrounds a curvature bubble with scale $\lambda \in (0,1]$, in order to apply the local estimates for eigenspinors given in [18]; there is no loss in taking $p = 1/3$ and fixed constants $0 < c_- < c_+ < \infty$. Hence, for $1 \le k,l \le N+1$,

$$\begin{aligned}((\boldsymbol{\eta}_l',\boldsymbol{\psi}_l'),(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k',\boldsymbol{\psi}_k'))_{L^2} &= ((\eta_l,\psi_l),(\eta_k,\psi_k))_{L^2(U_0)} + \sum_{p=1}^m ((\eta_l,\psi_l),(\eta_k,\psi_k))_{L^2(B_p)} \quad \text{(Term 1)}\\ &\quad + 2\,((\eta_l,\psi_l),(1-\chi_0)(\eta_k,\psi_k))_{L^2(U_0)} \quad \text{(Term 2)}\\ &\quad + 2\sum_{p=1}^m ((\eta_l,\psi_l),(-\eta_k,(1-\chi_p)\psi_k))_{L^2(B_p)} \quad \text{(Term 3)}\\ &\quad + ((1-\chi_0)(\eta_l,\psi_l),(1-\chi_0)(\eta_k,\psi_k))_{L^2(U_0)} \quad \text{(Term 4)}\\ &\quad + \sum_{p=1}^m ((-\eta_l,(1-\chi_p)\psi_l),(-\eta_k,(1-\chi_p)\psi_k))_{L^2(B_p)} \quad \text{(Term 5)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, the first inner product (Term 1) is equal to

$$((\eta_l,\psi_l),(\eta_k,\psi_k))_{L^2(U_0)} + \sum_{p=1}^m ((\eta_l,\psi_l),(\eta_k,\psi_k))_{L^2(B_p)} = ((\eta_l,\psi_l),(\eta_k,\psi_k))_{L^2(X)} = \delta_{kl}.$$

The second inner product (Term 2) is bounded by twice

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\eta_l,\psi_l)\|_{L^4(U_0)}\|(1-\chi_0)(\eta_k,\psi_k)\|_{L^{4/3}(U_0)}\\
&\le \|1-\chi_0\|_{L^2(U_0)}\|(\eta_k,\psi_k)\|^2_{L^4(U_0)}\\
&\le C\|1-\chi_0\|_{L^2(U_0)}\|(\eta_k,\psi_k)\|^2_{L^2(X)} \quad \text{(by Lemmas 6.1 and 8.7)}\\
&\le C\lambda^{2/3},
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the definition of χ_0. For $1\le p\le m$, the pth terms in the third inner product (Term 3) are bounded by twice

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\eta_l,\eta_k)_{L^2(B_p)} + ((1-\chi_p)\psi_l,(1-\chi_p)\psi_k)_{L^2(B_p)}\\
&\le \|\eta_l\|_{L^4(X)}\|\eta_k\|_{L^4(X)}\cdot(\operatorname{Vol}B_p)^{1/2}\\
&\quad + \|\psi_l\|_{L^4(B_p-\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)}\|\psi_k\|_{L^4(B_p-\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)}\|1-\chi_p\|_{L^2(B_p)}\\
&\le C\left((\operatorname{Vol}B_p)^{1/2}+\|1-\chi_p\|_{L^2(B_p)}\right)\|(\eta,\psi)\|_{L^2(X)} \quad \text{(by Lemmas 6.1 and 8.7)}\\
&\le C\lambda^{2/3},
\end{aligned}$$

the final inequality following from the definitions of B_p and χ_p. An upper bound for the small eigenvalues, required by the preceding applications of Lemma 8.7, is provided by Proposition 8.15. The fourth and fifth inner products are also bounded by $C\lambda^{2/3}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 8.24. □

Proof of Assertion (2) in Proposition 8.19. We have, for $1\le k,l\le N$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\left(\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l),\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_k)\right)_{L^2}-\delta_{kl}\right|\\
&\le \left|\left(\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l),\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_k)\right)_{L^2}-\left((\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l),(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_k)\right)_{L^2}\right|\\
&\quad + \left|\left((\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l),(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_k)\right)_{L^2}-\delta_{kl}\right|\\
&\le \left|\left(\Pi^\perp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l),\Pi^\perp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_k)\right)_{L^2}\right| + C\lambda^{2/3} \quad \text{(by Lemma 8.24)}\\
&\le \|\Pi^\perp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l)\|_{L^2}\|\Pi^\perp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_k)\|_{L^2}+C\lambda^{2/3}\\
&\le C\left((-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}+\lambda^{2/3}\right) \quad \text{(by Assertion (1) of Proposition 8.15)}
\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\left|\left(\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l),\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_k)\right)_{L^2}-\delta_{kl}\right| \le C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}, \quad 1\le k,l\le N. \tag{8.55}$$

Thus, for small enough λ, the vectors $\{\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l)\}_{l=1}^N$ form an approximately L^2-orthonormal basis for $\operatorname{Ker}T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$. This proves the second assertion of Proposition 8.19. □

Proof of Assertion (3) in Proposition 8.19. Finally, we turn to the problem of estimating the orthogonal projections of $(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1},\boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})$. Let $\{(\boldsymbol{\xi}_l,\boldsymbol{\varphi}_l)\}_{l=1}^N$ be an ordered, L^2-orthonormal basis for $\operatorname{Ker}T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$ obtained by applying Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization to the basis $\{\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l)\}_{l=1}^N$:

$$(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_l,\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_l) = \Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_l,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_l) - \sum_{k=1}^{l-1}(\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k,\boldsymbol{\psi}'_k),(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k,\boldsymbol{\varphi}_k))_{L^2}\cdot(\boldsymbol{\xi}_k,\boldsymbol{\varphi}_k) \tag{8.56}$$

with

$$(\boldsymbol{\xi}_l, \boldsymbol{\varphi}_l) = \frac{(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_l, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_l)}{\|(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_l, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_l)\|_{L^2}}, \quad 1 \le l \le N.$$

By the inner-product estimates in Lemma 8.24 and the orthogonal-complement estimates of Assertion (1) in Proposition 8.19 we have, for $1 \le k \le N$,

$$\begin{aligned} &|((\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1}), \Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_k))_{L^2}| \\ &= |((\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1}), (\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_k))_{L^2} - ((\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1}), \Pi^{\perp}_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_k, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_k))_{L^2}| \\ &\le C\lambda^{2/3} + C(1+\lambda^{1/3})(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4} \le C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.57}$$

Consequently, by the Gram-Schmidt equations (8.56) together with the inner-product estimates (8.57), and the fact that

$$\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1}) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left((\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1}), (\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \boldsymbol{\varphi}_k)\right)_{L^2} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\xi}_k, \boldsymbol{\varphi}_k),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Pi_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})\|_{L^2} \le C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}, \\ &\|\Pi^{\perp}_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})\|_{L^2} \ge 1 - C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.58}$$

This proves the third and final assertion of Proposition 8.19. □

8.4. **A lower bound for the first non-small eigenvalue.** Lastly, we compute a lower bound for the $(N+1)$-st eigenvalue of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$. Recall that (η_{N+1}, ψ_{N+1}) is the L^2-unit eigenvector associated to the $(N+1)$-st eigenvalue $\mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi]$ of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$.

The quantity $\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0]$ is the least positive eigenvalue of the Laplacian $d^1_{A_0,\Phi_0}d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ over X, whereas $\nu_2[A_p]$ is the least positive eigenvalue of $D_{A_p,g_p}D^*_{A_p,g_p}$ over S^4. Hence, the least positive eigenvalue of $T_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$ is given by

$$K = \min\{\nu_2[A_0,\Phi_0], \nu_2[A_1], \dots, \nu_2[A_m]\}.$$

We have:

Proposition 8.25. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda \in (0,\lambda_0]$, the following holds:*

$$\mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi] \ge K - C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}.$$

Proof of Theorem 8.3, given Proposition 8.25. Combine Propositions 8.15 and 8.25. □

Proof of Proposition 8.25. Recall that

$$(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1}) = ((\chi_0\eta_{N+1}, \chi_0\psi_{N+1}), \chi_1\psi_{N+1}, \dots, \chi_m\psi_{N+1}).$$

Hence,

$$T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1}, \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1}) = d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0\eta_{N+1}, \chi_0\psi_{N+1}) \oplus \bigoplus_{p=1}^{m} D^*_{A_p,g_p}\chi_p\psi_{N+1}.$$

Therefore, because

$$\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2} = \sqrt{\mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi]} \cdot \|(\eta_{N+1}, \psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2},$$

and $\|(\eta_{N+1},\psi_{N+1})\|_{L^2}=1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1},\boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})\|^2_{L^2}\\
&= \|d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}(\chi_0\eta_{N+1},\chi_0\psi_{N+1})\|^2_{L^2} + \sum_{p=1}^m \|D^*_{A_p,g_p}\chi_p\psi_{N+1}\|^2_{L^2}\\
&\le \sum_{p=0}^m \|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1},\psi_{N+1})\|^2_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)} + C((-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}+\lambda^{1/3})\\
&\quad + C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1},\psi_{N+1})\|^2_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_0)}\\
&\quad + \sum_{p=1}^m C\lambda^{1/6}\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1},\psi_{N+1})\|^2_{L^2(\operatorname{supp}\chi_p)},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the estimates (8.46) and (8.50). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1},\boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})\|^2_{L^2}\\
&\le (1+C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4})\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\eta_{N+1},\psi_{N+1})\|^2_{L^2(X)} + C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}\\
&= \mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi](1+C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}) + C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the upper bound (8.31) for $\mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi]$, we obtain

$$\|T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1},\boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})\|_{L^2} \le \left(\sqrt{\mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi]} + C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\right).$$

In the other direction, we have the eigenvalue estimate

$$\|T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\psi})\|_{L^2} \ge \sqrt{K}\cdot\|(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\psi})\|_{L^2}$$

for all $(\boldsymbol{\eta},\boldsymbol{\psi})\in(\operatorname{Ker}T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}})^\perp$ and so by the orthogonal projection estimates (8.58),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1},\boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})\|_{L^2} &\ge \sqrt{K}\cdot\|\Pi^\perp_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1},\boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})\|_{L^2}\\
&\ge \sqrt{K}(1-C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these upper and lower L^2 bounds for $T^*_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{N+1},\boldsymbol{\psi}'_{N+1})$ yields

$$\sqrt{K}\left(1-C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}\right) \le \sqrt{\mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi]} + C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4},$$

and this gives the lower bound on $\mu_{N+1}[A,\Phi]$ for small enough λ_0 and all $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_0]$. □

8.5. **A map from the direct sum of kernels to the small-eigenvalue eigenspace.** Though not necessary for the proof of Theorem 8.3 (whose main conclusion is the lower-bound on the first non-small eigenvalue), it is still convenient at this point to define a map from the direct sum of the kernels of the operators $d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and $D^*_{A_p,g_p}$, for $p=1,\dots,m$ (as given by the kernel of the diagonal operator $T_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$), to the small-eigenvalue eigenspace of the operator $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$. This map will be important in [26], where we prove the injectivity and surjectivity of the gluing maps to the extended PU(2)-monopole moduli space. It is essentially an inverse, modulo a small error, to the map — implicit in in the conclusion of Proposition 8.19 — from the small-eigenvalue eigenspace of the operator $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ to the direct sum of the kernels of the operators $d^{1,*}_{A_0,\Phi_0}$ and $D^*_{A_p,g_p}$ (again as given by the kernel of the diagonal operator $T_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{\Phi}}$).

Most of the work has already been carried out in §8.2, where we used cut-and-paste techniques to construct a set $\{(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\}_{l=1}^N$ of approximate eigenvectors for the operator $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$, which were approximately L^2-orthonormal. It suffices here to estimate the error between these approximate eigenvectors and their L^2-orthogonal projections onto the small-eigenvalue eigenspace $\operatorname{Ran}\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ of $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ and then estimate their L^2 inner products.

Proposition 8.26. *Continue the above notation. Then there are positive constants C and λ_0 such that for all $\lambda\in(0,\lambda_0]$, the following holds:*

$$\|\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2(X)} \le C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/4}, \quad 1\le l\le N, \tag{8.59}$$

$$\left|(\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_k,\varphi'_k),\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l))_{L^2(X)}-\delta_{kl}\right| \le C(-\log\lambda)^{-3/2}, \quad 1\le k,l\le N. \tag{8.60}$$

Proof. We need to estimate $\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)$, for $1\le l\le N$, where (ξ'_l,φ'_l) are the ordered, approximately L^2-orthonormal, approximate eigenvectors corresponding to the first N eigenvalues of the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ (see their construction in §8.2) and $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ is L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(X,V^-)$ onto the small-eigenvalue eigenspace of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$.

Since $\operatorname{Ker} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ is a closed subspace (contained in $\operatorname{Ran}\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$) and $(\operatorname{Ker} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi})^\perp=\operatorname{Ran} d^1_{A,\Phi}$, there is a unique

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}(a_l,\phi_l)\in\operatorname{Ran}\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\subset\operatorname{Ran} d^1_{A,\Phi}\subset L^2(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(X,V^-)$$

such that

$$\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)=d^1_{A,\Phi}(a_l,\phi_l)=\frac{((\xi'_l,\varphi'_l),d^1_{A,\Phi}(a_l,\phi_l))_{L^2}}{\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a_l,\phi_l)\|^2_{L^2}}d^1_{A,\Phi}(a_l,\phi_l).$$

Hence, integrating by parts, we see that

$$\|\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2}\le\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2}\frac{\|(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^2}}{\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^2}}.$$

We may suppose without loss that

$$(a_l,\phi_l)\in(\operatorname{Ker} d^1_{A,\Phi}\circ\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu})^\perp=\operatorname{Ran}\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\circ d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi},$$

and therefore

$$\|(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^2}\le\mu^{-1/2}\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a_l,\phi_l)\|_{L^2}.$$

Hence, combining the preceding estimates, we see

$$\|\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2}\le c\mu^{-1/2}\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)\|_{L^2}.$$

This estimate, together with inequalities (8.34) (for $p=0$ and $1\le i\le n$) and (8.35) (for $1\le p\le m$ and $1\le i\le 2\kappa_p$, recalling that $N=n+2\sum_{p=1}^m\kappa_p$), therefore yields estimate (8.59) for $l=1,\dots,N$.

The L^2 inner-product estimates (8.60) now follow from our L^2 inner-product estimates (8.39) for $((\xi'_k,\varphi'_k),(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l))_{L^2(X)}$ and from the L^2 orthogonal-projection estimates (8.59), using $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)=(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)-\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi'_l,\varphi'_l)$. □

9. EXISTENCE OF SOLUTIONS TO THE EXTENDED PU(2)-MONOPOLE EQUATIONS

In this section we come to the heart of the matter, namely the completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1. While our proof builds on the results of the preceding sections — by way of our estimates in §5 for approximate solutions and our eigenvalue estimates in §8 — there remains the substantial task of producing a suitable estimate for a right inverse $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ of the linearization, $d^1_{A,\Phi}$, of the PU(2) monopole equations (2.1). This estimate, given in Corollary 9.3, is the principal technical result of our paper and its proof draws heavily on the global estimates of §6, as well as the decay estimates for harmonic spinors discussed in [18] and some delicate applications in §7. Rather than attempting to solve the PU(2) monopole equations (2.1) directly, for which there are obstructions due to the presence of small eigenvalues — as discussed in §8 — we instead pursue a strategy pioneered by Taubes in [60] and solve a weaker version of these equations, the *extended* PU(2) *monopole equations* (see (9.8)). We set up these extended equations in §9.1. Unlike in [60], we shall not attempt to also solve the *obstruction equation* for PU(2) monopoles, (9.8), as this will not be necessary for our topological applications [27], though this problem is nonetheless an interesting one in its own right [50]. Once a suitable estimate for $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ is in place, which is the task of §9.4, the solution to the extended PU(2) monopole equations then follows in a standard way by a fixed-point argument, as we see in §9.5. Finally, we assemble the preceding ingredients in §9.6 and finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.

9.1. **The extended PU(2) monopole equations.** Given an L^2_k approximate PU(2) monopole (A,Φ), our goal in this section is to solve the quasi-linear system

$$\mathfrak{S}(A+a,\Phi+\phi)=\begin{pmatrix}(F^+(A+a))_0-\tau\rho^{-1}((\Phi+\phi)\otimes(\Phi+\phi)^*)_{00}\\ D_{A+a}(\Phi+\phi)\end{pmatrix}=0, \tag{9.1}$$

for a deformation

$$(a,\phi)\in L^2_k(\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_k(V^+)$$

such that $(A+a,\Phi+\phi)$ is a PU(2) monopole. The strategy, adapted from [12, §7.2], [58], and [62, §5], is to first compute an *a priori* $L^2_{1,A}$ estimate for a solution (a,ϕ) to the linearization of (9.1) and prove existence of an L^2_1 solution (a,ϕ) to the full non-linear equation via a Banach-space fixed-point lemma. In order for this estimate to be useful we need to know the precise dependence of the constant on the pair (A,Φ). We then use a separate regularity argument to show that the solution (a,ϕ) is L^2_k. From [29, Equation (3.2)], we recall that equation (9.1) can be rewritten as a first-order, quasi-linear, partial differential equation

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)+\{(a,\phi),(a,\phi)\}=-\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi), \tag{9.2}$$

where the linearization

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}=(D\mathfrak{S})_{A,\Phi}:\quad \begin{matrix}L^2_k(\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\\ \oplus\\ L^2_k(V^+)\end{matrix}\quad\to\quad\begin{matrix}L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\\ \oplus\\ L^2_{k-1}(V^-)\end{matrix}$$

is given by [29, Equation (2.36)]

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)=\begin{pmatrix}d^+_Aa-\tau\rho^{-1}(\Phi\otimes\phi^*+\phi\otimes\Phi^*)_{00}\\ D_A\phi+\rho(a)\Phi\end{pmatrix}, \tag{9.3}$$

and the quadratic term $\{(a,\phi),(a,\phi)\}$ is defined by the bilinear form

$$\{(a,\phi),(b,\varphi)\} = \begin{pmatrix} (a\wedge b)^+ - \tau\rho^{-1}(\phi\otimes\varphi^*)_{00} \\ \rho(a)\varphi \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9.4}$$

for $(b,\varphi)\in L^2_k(\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_k(V^+)$.

We shall see in [26], using an argument similar to that of §8, that the composition of the linearization of the splicing map with L^2-orthogonal projection induces an isomorphism from tangent spaces to the bundle of gluing data onto the kernel of $d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi}+d^1_{A,\Phi}$, where $d^0_{A,\Phi}$ is the linearization [29, Proposition 2.1 & Equation (2.38)] of the gauge group action at a pair (A,Φ). Thus, it is natural to seek a deformation (a,ϕ) which is L^2-orthogonal to the kernel of $d^1_{A,\Phi}$ or, equivalently, a deformation (a,ϕ) lying the image of $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$, so

$$(a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), \quad \text{for } (v,\psi)\in L^2_{k+1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_{k+1}(V^-), \tag{9.5}$$

where the first-order operator $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ is given by equation (8.16). Substituting (9.5) into (9.2) yields a second-order, quasi-linear, elliptic partial differential equation

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) + \{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\} = -\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi). \tag{9.6}$$

Equation (9.6) also serves as a gauge-fixing condition for a solution (a,ϕ) to equation (9.2) since

$$d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi}\circ d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) = (d^1_{A,\Phi}\circ d^0_{A,\Phi})^*(v,\psi) = (\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\cdot)^*(v,\psi),$$

and thus, for example, $d^{0,*}_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi) = 0$ if (A,Φ) is a PU(2) monopole (see the remarks following equation (2.36) in [29]).

The Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$, as we have seen in §8, will in general have *small eigenvalues* and so — even if the Laplacian has no kernel — it will not be uniformly invertible, in the sense that the small eigenvalues tend to zero when we try to make $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$ small enough to solve the non-linear equation (9.6) by allowing $[A,\Phi]$ to move closer to an ideal pair $[A_0,\Phi_0,\mathbf{x}]\in\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)\times\mathrm{Sym}^\ell$. In a gauge-theory context, such small-eigenvalue problems were first addressed by Taubes in [60], [62] in the case of the anti-self-dual equation. Thus, in place of the PU(2) monopole equation

$$\mathfrak{S}((A,\Phi)+(a,\phi)) = 0 \tag{9.7}$$

for a solution $(a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)$, we follow [60], [62] and consider the pair of equations

$$\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}((A,\Phi)+(a,\phi)) = 0, \tag{9.8}$$

$$\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}((A,\Phi)+(a,\phi)) = 0, \tag{9.9}$$

for a solution $(a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)$, with

$$(v,\psi)\in L^2_{k+1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_{k+1}(V^-)$$

satisfying the constraint

$$\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(v,\psi) = 0. \tag{9.10}$$

Equation (9.8) is called the *extended* PU(2) *monopole equation*. Here, $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ is the L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(V^-)$ onto the finite-dimensional subspace spanned by the eigenvectors of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ with eigenvalues in $[0,\mu]$, where μ is a positive constant (an upper bound for the small eigenvalues), and $\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu} := \mathrm{id} - \Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$.

Because of the small-eigenvalue problem, we shall only explicitly solve equation (9.8); the true solutions to equation (9.7) are then simply the solutions to equation (9.8) which also satisfy equation (9.9).

Equation (9.8) may be rewritten as

$$\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\left(d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) + \{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\}\right) = -\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi), \tag{9.11}$$

where again (v,ψ) obeys the constraint (9.10). For the purposes of the regularity theory of §4, it is useful to rewrite equation (9.11) as

$$\begin{aligned} d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) &+ \{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\} \\ &= \Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\left(\{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\}\right) - \Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi). \end{aligned} \tag{9.12}$$

In view of equation (9.12), it will be useful to consider estimates for solutions to the following second-order, quasi-linear elliptic equation,

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) + \{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\} = (w,s). \tag{9.13}$$

Of course, equation (9.13) reduces to (9.12) when $(w,s) \in \Gamma(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus\Gamma(V^-)$ is given by the right-hand side of equation (9.12).

Equation (9.9) is called the PU(2) *monopole obstruction equation* and takes the form

$$\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\left(\{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\} - \mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\right) = 0, \tag{9.14}$$

as we can easily see.

On the other hand, for the purposes of applying Banach-space fixed-point theory to solve the non-linear equation (9.11), it is convenient to write

$$(v,\psi) = G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi) \quad \text{for some } (\xi,\varphi) \in L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_{k-1}(V^-),$$

where

$$G_{A,\Phi,\mu} : \begin{array}{c} L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E) \\ \oplus \\ L^2_{k-1}(V^-) \end{array} \to \begin{array}{c} L^2_{k+1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E) \\ \oplus \\ L^2_{k+1}(V^-) \end{array}$$

is the Green's operator for the Laplacian

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}\circ\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu} : \begin{array}{c} L^2_{k+1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E) \\ \oplus \\ L^2_{k+1}(V^-) \end{array} \to \begin{array}{c} L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E) \\ \oplus \\ L^2_{k-1}(V^-) \end{array}$$

Thus, $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}G_{A,\Phi,\mu} = \Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ and $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(v,\psi) = \Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi) = 0$ for any $(\xi,\varphi) \in L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_{k-1}(V^-)$, so the constraint (9.10) is obeyed. Therefore, setting

$$P_{A,\Phi,\mu} = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}G_{A,\Phi,\mu},$$

it suffices to solve for

$$(\xi,\varphi) \in L^2_{k-1}(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_{k-1}(V^-),$$

such that

$$(\xi,\varphi)+\{P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi),P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)\}=-\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi), \tag{9.15}$$

because, noting that $\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)=\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}d^{1}_{A,\Phi}P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)$, the resulting $(v,\psi)=G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)$ solves equation (9.11), namely

$$\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}\left((\xi,\varphi)+\{P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi),P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)\}+\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\right)=0,$$

as one can see by just applying $P^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ to equation (9.15), *as well as* the constraint $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(v,\psi)=\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)=0$.

Noting that $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)=0$, the solution (ξ,φ) to (9.15) solves equation (9.9) or equivalently equation (9.14), which now takes the shape

$$\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\left(\{P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi),P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)\}+\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\right)=0,$$

if and only if

$$\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)=0. \tag{9.16}$$

For applications of Banach-space fixed-point theory, the integral form (9.15) of the extended anti-self-dual equation is a little more convenient, while for the purposes of regularity theory and localization, we use the "differential" form (9.12).

Remark 9.1. If (a,ϕ) is a solution to the extended PU(2)-monopole equations (9.8) for the small-eigenvalue cutoff parameter μ, then it is also a solution to the (weaker) equations defined by a parameter $\mu'\geq\mu$. Indeed, if

$$\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}((A,\Phi)+(a,\phi))=0,$$

then we also have

$$\begin{aligned}0&=\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu'}\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}((A,\Phi)+(a,\phi))\\&=\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu'}(1-\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu})\mathfrak{S}((A,\Phi)+(a,\phi))\\&=\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu'}\mathfrak{S}((A,\Phi)+(a,\phi)),\end{aligned}$$

where the final equality follows because $\operatorname{Ran}\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\subseteq\operatorname{Ran}\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu'}$. This point will be important in [27].

9.2. **Comments on intrinsic, extended PU(2) monopole equations.** One difficulty with using the extended PU(2) monopole equations, as we shall explain further in [27], is that the equations (9.8) and (9.9) are not intrinsic to the configuration space $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$, unlike their counterpart (9.1) in the unobstructed case. Hence, solutions $(A+a,\Phi+\phi)$ to (9.8) corresponding to bundles of gluing data defined by the different strata Σ of the symmetric product $\operatorname{Sym}^{\ell}(X)$ will not fit together (even aside from the jumping-line or spectral flow problem) to form a smooth submanifold of $\mathcal{C}^{*,0}(\mathfrak{t})$.

To circumvent this problem we could try to use a different version of equations (9.8) and (9.9), where the spectral projections are replaced by ones which are intrinsic to the configuration space $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t})$ rather than a bundle of gluing data defined by a single stratum $\Sigma\subset\operatorname{Sym}^{\ell}(X)$. Indeed, to describe solutions to the SU(2) anti-self-dual equation near the product connection, an "intrinsic, extended anti-self-dual equation" was introduced in [11] and it is asserted (without proof) in [34] that Taubes' approach to gluing for his version of the (non-intrinsic) extended anti-self-dual equation can be adapted to the intrinsic, extended equation. Thus inspired by [11] and [34], we could consider the pair of equations

$$\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi) = 0, \tag{9.17}$$

$$\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi) = 0. \tag{9.18}$$

Equation (9.17) is called the *intrinsic, extended* PU(2) *monopole equation*. Here, $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ is the L^2-orthogonal projection from $L^2(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(V^-)$ onto the finite-dimensional subspace spanned by the eigenvectors of $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ with eigenvalues in $[0,\mu]$, where μ is a positive constant (an upper bound for the small eigenvalues), and $\Pi^{\perp}_{A,\Phi,\mu} := \mathrm{id} - \Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$.

An unsatisfactory feature of equation (9.17) is that the projections $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu} = \Pi_{A'+a,\Phi'+\phi,\mu}$ depend on the deformation sought from the initial approximate solution, (A',Φ'), and this complicates the analysis considerably in comparison with the simpler equation (9.8), where the projection $\Pi_{A',\Phi',\mu}$ depends only on the data, (A',Φ'), and not the deformation sought, (a,ϕ). While it may be possible to work around this problem for the anti-self-dual equation, it appears difficult for PU(2) monopoles. For example, if we tried to use the right-inverse $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ for $d^1_{A,\Phi}$ then we would encounter a fairly serious problem in adapting the proof of Theorem 9.2 (and Corollary 9.3) — where we currently derive an estimate for $P_{A',\Phi',\mu}$ — as we assumed that $\Phi'\equiv 0$ where the connection A' bubbles: this assumption is used in a crucial way in equation (9.24). On the other hand, if we use the right-inverse $P_{A',\Phi',\mu}$ for $d^1_{A',\Phi'}$ then we would have to compare the projections $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ and $\Pi_{A',\Phi',\mu}$. Because of the nature of the Bochner formulas involved, namely (6.2) and (6.3), the two projections appear surprisingly difficult to compare when $(A,\Phi) = (A'+a,\Phi'+\phi)$ and we know at most that $\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{1,A'}}$ is small.

The strategy we use instead in [27] is to construct a space of global gluing data, $\mathbf{Gl}(\mathcal{U}_{\mu,\ell},\lambda_0)$ over $\mathcal{U}_{\mu,\ell}\times\mathrm{Sym}^{\ell}(X)$, a global splicing map $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu}$, and then deform $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu}$ to a global gluing map $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu}$ using the results of the present article.

9.3. **Comments on the gluing methods of Taubes, Donaldson, and Mrowka.**

It is convenient at this point to indicate why the method employed by Taubes in [58], [60], [62] for solving the anti-self-dual equation,

$$d^+_A a + (a\wedge a)^+ = -F^+_A,$$

does not apply to the PU(2) monopole equation with merely routine modifications. His method requires the Bochner-Weitzenböck formula (6.2) for the Laplacian $d^+_A d^{+,*}_A$ in order to obtain the necessary *a priori* $L^2_{1,A}$ estimate for a. However, as we can see from the Bochner formulas in §6, the corresponding Laplacian in the case of the PU(2) monopole equation is given by

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi} = \begin{pmatrix} d^+_A d^{+,*}_A & 0 \\ 0 & D_A D^*_A \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} r^{11}_{A,\Phi} & r^{12}_{A,\Phi} \\ r^{21}_{A,\Phi} & r^{22}_{A,\Phi} \end{pmatrix},$$

where the remainder term $R_{A,\Phi} = (r^{ij}_{A,\Phi})$ is a first-order linear differential operator, with coefficients containing up through first-order derivatives of A and Φ, and is diagonal only if $\Phi\equiv 0$.

Thus, while the term F_A^+ in the Bochner formula for $d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}$ will be bounded in L^∞ if g is conformally flat near the gluing sites and, more generally, $L^{\sharp,2}$-small as desired (for small enough scales), the term F_A^- in the formula for $D_A D_A^*$ will only be bounded in $L^{\sharp,2}$ if (A,Φ) is an approximate PU(2) monopole obtained by the splicing construction. In particular, the term F_A^- is not $L^{\sharp,2}$-small near the gluing sites and so the rearrangement arguments used to obtain uniform, global elliptic estimates for $d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}$ in [62, §5] or [16, §5] no longer work.

On the other hand, the method for solving the anti-self-dual equation employed by Donaldson in [10], [12] — which avoids the use of Bochner-Weitzenböck formulas by exploiting the conformal invariance of the anti-self-dual equation—does not apply without significant modification to the PU(2) monopole equation since the latter is not conformally invariant [29]. Much the same problem would arise if we sought to replace the small annuli surrounding points of curvature concentration with long cylinders — by analogy with the method described by Mrowka in [51]. Of course, we could (with either conformal model) transform the equations on (X,g) to an equivalent set of equations, where the metrics now vary with the tube lengths T_i or neck radii parameters λ_i. While such a strategy might circumvent some of the analytical difficulties associated with the unwanted appearance of F_A^- in the Bochner formulas, it would lead to models for moduli space ends where the metric varies (albeit conformally) with the location of the gluing centers $\mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$. As will be clearer from our discussion of the requisite intersection theory in [27], such behavior seems undesirable because it makes it more difficult to patch together the local gluing models (for moduli space ends) and thus form a global model for the end of the moduli space $\bar{M}(\mathfrak{t})$ near a level $M^{\mathrm{sw}}(\mathfrak{s}) \times \mathrm{Sym}^\ell(X)$.

9.4. **Global estimates: linear theory.** Our next task is to parlay the global elliptic estimates for d_A^+ and D_A in the preceding section into global elliptic estimates for $d_{A,\Phi}^1$ and its partial right inverse $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$. The following elliptic estimates, coupled with our bounds on the small eigenvalues, form the technical heart of our main gluing result, Theorem 1.1. We begin with an $L^2_{1,A}$ elliptic estimate for $d_{A,\Phi}^{1,*}(v,\psi)$:

Theorem 9.2. *Let X be a closed, oriented, smooth four-manifold with Riemannian metric g. Given the data of the splicing construction in §3, there are constants*

$$C = C(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \kappa, \|F_{A_d}\|_{L^\infty}, \|F_{A_e}\|_{L^\infty}, \|\vartheta\|_{L^\infty}, \mu) < \infty, \tag{9.19}$$

and $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(C) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let (A,Φ) be an L^2_4 pair on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ produced by the splicing construction of §3. Then for all $(v,\psi) \in L^2_3(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_3(V^-)$,

$$\|d_{A,\Phi}^{1,*}(v,\psi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \le C(\|d_{A,\Phi}^1 d_{A,\Phi}^{1,*}(v,\psi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X)} + \|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2(X)}). \tag{9.20}$$

Proof. Let $U' \subset X$ be the open subset where $|\Phi| > 0$, so $\bar{U}' = \operatorname{supp}\Phi$. Denote $(a,\phi) = d_{A,\Phi}^{1,*}(v,\psi)$. Since $a = d_A^{+,*}v + (\cdot\Phi)^*\psi$ and, schematically,

$$\nabla_A((\cdot\Phi)^*\psi) = \nabla_A\Phi \otimes \psi + \Phi \otimes \nabla_A\psi,$$

then Hölder's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|a\|_{L^2_{1,A}} &\le \|d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} + \|\nabla_A((\cdot\Phi)^*\psi)\|_{L^2} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty}\|\psi\|_{L^2(U')} \\ &\le \|d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} + \|\nabla_A\Phi\|_{L^4}\|\psi\|_{L^4(U')} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^2(U')} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty}\|\psi\|_{L^2(U')}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 6.1,

$$\|a\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le \|d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} + c\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty\cap L^4_{1,A}}\|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(U')}. \tag{9.21}$$

Using integration by parts, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\|d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2}^2 &= (d_A^{+,*}v, d_A^{+,*}v)_{L^2} = (d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}v, v)_{L^2}\\ &\le \|d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2}\|v\|_{L^2} \le \frac{1}{2}(\|d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2}^2 + \|v\|_{L^2}^2),\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\|d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\|d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2} + \|v\|_{L^2}). \tag{9.22}$$

Corollary 6.3 gives the following $L^2_{1,A}$ estimate for $d_A^{+,*}v$:

$$\|d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le C(\|d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} + \|v\|_{L^2}).$$

Recall that

$$d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}v = d_A^+ a - d_A^+(\cdot\Phi)^*\psi, \tag{9.23}$$

where, schematically,

$$d_A^+((\cdot\Phi)^*\psi) = \nabla_A\Phi\otimes\psi + \Phi\otimes\nabla_A\psi.$$

This gives, for any $2 < q \le \infty$, using the embeddings $L^2_1 \subset L^{2\sharp,4}$ and $L^q \subset L^\sharp$ of [16, Lemma 4.1],

$$\begin{aligned}\|d_A^+(\cdot\Phi)^*\psi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} &\le \|\nabla_A\Phi\|_{L^{2\sharp,4}}\|\psi\|_{L^{2\sharp,4}(U')} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(U')}\\ &\le c\|\nabla_A\Phi\|_{L^2_{1,A}}\|\psi\|_{L^2_{1,A}(U')} + c\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla_A\psi\|_{L^q(U')}\\ &\le c\|\Phi\|_{C^0\cap L^2_{2,A}}\|\psi\|_{L^q_{1,A}(U')}.\end{aligned} \tag{9.24}$$

Substituting the estimate (9.24) into the inequality (9.22), via the expression (9.23) for $d_A^+ d_A^{+,*}v$, then yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|d_A^{+,*}v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} &\le C(\|d_A^+ a\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} + \|d_A^+(\cdot\Phi)^*\psi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} + \|v\|_{L^2})\\ &\le C(\|d_A^+ a\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} + \|\Phi\|_{C^0\cap L^2_{2,A}}\|\psi\|_{L^q_{1,A}(U')} + \|v\|_{L^2}).\end{aligned} \tag{9.25}$$

Therefore, inequalities (9.21) and (9.25) imply that

$$\|a\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le C(\|d_A^+ a\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} + \|\psi\|_{L^q_{1,A}(U')} + \|v\|_{L^2}). \tag{9.26}$$

To estimate the $L^{\sharp,2}$ norm of $d_A^+ a$ in the right-hand side of inequality (9.26), note that from the definition (9.3) of $d^1_{A,\Phi}$ we have

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}\begin{pmatrix}a\\ \phi\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}d_A^+ a - (\Phi\otimes\phi^* + \phi\otimes\Phi^*)_{00}\\ a\cdot\Phi + D_A\phi\end{pmatrix},$$

and thus,

$$\|d_A^+ a\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} \le \|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} + c\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty}\|\phi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}}. \tag{9.27}$$

Choosing $4/3 \le p \le 2$ via $1/p = 1/4 + 1/q$ when $2 \le q \le 4$, and noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= -(\Phi \otimes (\cdot)^* + (\cdot) \otimes \Phi^*)^*_{00} v + D_A^* \psi, \\ &= \Phi \otimes v + D_A^* \psi \quad \text{(schematically)}, \end{aligned}$$

we have (schematically)

$$D_A D_A^* \psi = \nabla_A \Phi \otimes v + \Phi \otimes \nabla_A v + D_A \phi,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_A D_A^* \psi\|_{L^p(U)} &\le \|\nabla_A \Phi\|_{L^4} \|v\|_{L^q} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty} \|\nabla_A v\|_{L^p} + \|D_A \phi\|_{L^p} \\ &\le c\|\Phi\|_{C^0 \cap L^2_{2,A}} \|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} + \|D_A \phi\|_{L^p}, \end{aligned} \tag{9.28}$$

and thus, recalling that U' obeys an interior cone condition with geometric cone independent of the (small) size of the ball radii and confining q to $2 < q \le 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi\|_{L^q_{1,A}(U')} &\le c\|\psi\|_{L^p_{2,A}(U')} \quad \text{(by [2, Theorem V.5.4])} \\ &\le C(\|D_A D_A^* \psi\|_{L^p(U)} + \|\psi\|_{L^2(U)}) \quad \text{(by Theorem 7.1 and [18])} \\ &\le C(\|D_A \phi\|_{L^p} + \|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} + \|\psi\|_{L^2}) \quad \text{(by (9.28))}, \end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$\|\psi\|_{L^q_{1,A}(U')} \le C(\|D_A \phi\|_{L^p} + \|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} + \|\psi\|_{L^2}). \tag{9.29}$$

Therefore, combining inequalities (9.26), (9.27), and (9.29), we obtain

$$\|a\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} + \|\phi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} + \|D_A \phi\|_{L^p} + \|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} + \|\psi\|_{L^2}), \tag{9.30}$$

Lemma 6.8 and the expression for $d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi\|_{L^2_{1,A}} &\le C(\|D_A \phi\|_{L^2} + \|\phi\|_{L^2}) \\ &\le C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)\|_{L^2} + \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty} \|a\|_{L^2} + \|\phi\|_{L^2}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|\phi\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)\|_{L^2} + \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2}). \tag{9.31}$$

Therefore, from the above $L^2_{1,A}$ estimates for a in (9.30) and for ϕ in (9.31), we see that

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} + \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2} + \|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2} + \|\phi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} + \|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}}). \tag{9.32}$$

Now $\|\phi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} \le c\|\phi\|_{L^2_{1,A}}$ and so the term $\|\phi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}}$ on the right-hand side of inequality (9.32) can be replaced by $\|\phi\|_{L^2}$ via the bound (9.31). Similarly, $\|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le C(\|d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^2} + \|v\|_{L^2})$ by Lemma 6.4 and so the interpolation inequality,

$$\|d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^2} \le \varepsilon \|d_A^+ d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^2} + \varepsilon^{-1} \|v\|_{L^2},$$

together with inequality (9.25) for $\|d_A^{+,*} v\|_{L^2_{1,A}}$, inequality (9.27) for $\|d_A^+ a\|_{L^{\sharp,2}}$, inequality (9.29) for $\|\psi\|_{L^p_{1,A}(U')}$, rearrangement for ε small, and the preceding bound for $\|\phi\|_{L^{\sharp,2}}$, allow us to replace $\|v\|_{L^2_{1,A}}$ by $\|v\|_{L^2}$ on the right-hand side of inequality (9.32). Hence, the estimate (9.32) takes the form

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \le C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}(a,\phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} + \|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2} + \|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2}).$$

Just as in equation (9.22) we have

$$\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2} \le \frac{1}{2}(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^2} + \|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2}),$$

and combining the last two inequalities completes the proof. □

Corollary 9.3. *Continue the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 9.2. Then for all* $(\xi,\varphi) \in L^{\sharp,2}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2(V^-)$,

$$\|P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \le C\|(\xi,\varphi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X)}, \tag{9.33}$$

where C *now also depends continuously on* $0 < \mu < \infty$.

Proof. We set $(v,\psi) = G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)$, so that

$$d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) = \Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi) \quad \text{and} \quad (a,\phi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi) = P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi).$$

For the $L^2_{1,A}$ estimate, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(a,\phi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}} &\le C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} + \|(v,\psi)\|_{L^2}) \quad \text{(by Theorem 9.2)}\\
&\le C(\|d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} + \mu^{-1}\|d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^2})\\
&= C\|\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}}\\
&\le C\left(\|(\xi,\varphi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} + \|\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,0)\|_{L^4} + \|\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(0,\varphi)\|_{L^2}\right) \quad \text{(by [16, Lemma 4.1])}\\
&\le C\left(\|(\xi,\varphi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} + \|\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,0)\|_{L^2} + \|(0,\varphi)\|_{L^2}\right) \quad \text{(by Lemma 8.7)}\\
&\le C\|(\xi,\varphi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}} \quad \text{(by Inequality (8.18)).}
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

9.5. **Existence of solutions to the extended PU(2) monopole equations.**

We now turn to the question of existence and uniqueness of solutions (v,ψ) to equation (9.8) or one of its equivalent forms, namely equations (9.11) or (9.12). We first recall the following elementary fixed-point result [12, Lemma 7.2.23].

Lemma 9.4. *Let* $q : \mathfrak{B} \to \mathfrak{B}$ *be a continuous map on a Banach space* $\mathfrak{B}$ *with* $q(0) = 0$ *and*

$$\|q(x_1) - q(x_2)\| \le K\left(\|x_1\| + \|x_2\|\right)\|x_1 - x_2\|$$

for some positive constant K *and all* x_1, x_2 *in* $\mathfrak{B}$. *Then for each* y *in* $\mathfrak{B}$ *with* $\|y\| < 1/(10K)$ *there is a unique* x *in* $\mathfrak{B}$ *such that* $\|x\| \le 1/(5K)$ *and* $x + q(x) = y$.

With the aid of Lemma 9.4, we obtain existence and uniqueness for solutions to equation (9.8).

Theorem 9.5. *Let (X, g) be a closed, oriented, C^∞ Riemannian four-manifold. There are constants C and $\varepsilon(C)$, with the dependence indicated in condition* (9.19)*, such that the following holds. Let (A, Φ) be an L^2_4 pair on $(\mathfrak{g}_E, V^+)$ produced by the splicing construction of §3, with*

$$\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)} < \varepsilon. \tag{9.34}$$

Then there is a unique solution $(v, \psi) \in C^0 \cap L^2_2(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_2(V^-)$ to the extended PU(2)*-monopole equation* (9.8) *such that $\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}(v, \psi) = 0$ and*

$$\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v, \psi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}(X)} \leq C\|\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}(X)}. \tag{9.35}$$

Moreover, if (A, Φ) is an L^2_l pair, for any $l \geq 3$, then the solution (v, ψ) is contained in $L^2_{l+1}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2_{l+1}(V^-)$.

Remark 9.6. The condition (9.34) is met by choosing a small enough relatively open submanifold $\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)$ and small enough constant $\lambda_0(C)$ (Proposition 5.5).

Proof. We try to solve equation (9.11) for solutions of the form $(v, \psi) = G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi, \varphi)$, where $(\xi, \varphi) \in L^{\sharp,2}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E)$ and $G_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ is the Green's operator for the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi} d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$ on $\operatorname{Ran} \Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}$. Therefore, as explained in §9.1, we seek solutions (ξ, φ) to equation (9.15). We now apply Lemma 9.4 to equation (9.15), with

$$\mathfrak{B} = L^{\sharp,2}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2(V^-),$$

choosing $y = -\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)$ and

$$q((\xi, \varphi)) = \{d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi} G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi, \varphi), d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi} G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi, \varphi)\},$$

so our goal is to solve

$$(\xi, \varphi) + q((\xi, \varphi)) = -\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi) \quad \text{on } L^{\sharp,2}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2(V^-).$$

For any $(\xi_1, \varphi_1), (\xi_2, \varphi_2) \in L^{\sharp,2}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2(V^-)$, the estimate in Theorem 9.2 yields

$$\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi} G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^2_{1,A}} \leq C\|(\xi_i, \varphi_i)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}}.$$

Therefore, applying the preceding estimates, Hölder's inequality, Lemma 6.1, and the $L^\sharp$-family of embedding and multiplication results of [16, Lemmas 4.1 & 4.3], we obtain

$$\|q((\xi_1, \varphi_1)) - q((\xi_2, \varphi_2))\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} \leq K_2 \left(\|(\xi_1, \varphi_1)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} + \|(\xi_2, \varphi_2)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}}\right) \|(\xi_1, \varphi_1) - (\xi_2, \varphi_2)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}},$$

where $K_2 = cZ_2$ with c a universal constant and Z_2 the constant of Theorem 9.2.

Thus, provided $\varepsilon \leq (10K_2)^{-1}$, we have $\|\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} < (10K_2)^{-1}$, and Lemma 9.4 implies that there is a unique solution $(\xi, \varphi) \in L^{\sharp,2}(\Lambda^+ \otimes \mathfrak{g}_E) \oplus L^2(V^-)$ to equation (9.15) such that $\|(\xi, \varphi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} \leq (5K_2)^{-1}$. The $L^{\sharp,2}$ estimate for (ξ, φ),

$$\|(\xi, \varphi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} \leq 2\|\mathfrak{S}(A, \Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}}, \tag{9.36}$$

follows from Theorem 9.2 and a standard rearrangement argument. To obtain the stated $L^2_{1,A}$ estimates for $d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v, \psi)$, observe that

$$d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v, \psi) = d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi} G_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi, \varphi) = P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi, \varphi), \tag{9.37}$$

so that the $L^2_{1,A}$ bound is obtained from

$$\begin{aligned}\|d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}} = \|P_{A,\Phi,\mu}(\xi,\varphi)\|_{L^2_{1,A}} &\le C\|(\xi,\varphi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} \quad \text{(by Corollary 9.3)}\\ &\le C\|\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2}} \quad \text{(by estimate (9.36))}.\end{aligned}$$

The final regularity assertion follows from Proposition 4.16, our regularity result for gluing solutions to the (extended) PU(2)-monopole equations. □

9.6. **Completion of proof of main theorem.** At this stage, we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1, namely the existence of gluing and obstruction maps. The conclusion of our proof of Theorem 1.1 is an almost immediate consequence of Theorem 9.5.

Completion of proof of Theorem 1.1. According to Theorem 9.5 there are well-defined, $\mathcal{G}_E$-equivariant maps $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_\mu$ on the open subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon) := \{(A,\Phi)\in\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t}) : \text{(9.39) holds}\}, \tag{9.38}$$

where the pairs (A,Φ) are required to satisfy the open constraints

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{Spec}(d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}) \subset [0,\tfrac{1}{2}\mu)\cup(\mu,\infty),\\ \|\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)\|_{L^{\sharp,2;2}(X)} < \varepsilon,\\ \|P_{A,\Phi,\mu}\|_A < C < \infty,\end{gathered} \tag{9.39}$$

where $C = C(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu},\kappa,\mu,g)$ is a uniform positive constant and $\|\cdot\|_A$ is the operator norm for $\operatorname{Hom}(L^{\sharp,2;2}(X), L^2_{1,A}(X))$.

On the open, $\mathcal{G}_E$-invariant subset $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon)\subset\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})$, the maps $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_\mu$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu &: (A,\Phi)\mapsto (A,\Phi) + d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}(v,\psi),\\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}_\mu &: (A,\Phi)\mapsto \Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\mathfrak{S}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu(A,\Phi)),\end{aligned}$$

taking values in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t})$ and $L^2(\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2(V^-)$, respectively, where $(v,\psi)\in\operatorname{Ran}\Pi^\perp_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ is the unique solution to the extended PU(2) monopole equations (9.11) produced by Theorem 9.5, given the approximate PU(2) monopole (A,Φ) in the image of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu,\Sigma}$.

The $\mathcal{G}_E$-equivariant maps $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu$ and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_\mu$ descend to an S^1-equivariant map and section,

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu &: \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon)\to\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}),\\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}_\mu &: \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon)\to\mathfrak{V}_\mu\end{aligned} \tag{9.40}$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon) = \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon)/\mathcal{G}_E$ and $\mathfrak{V}_\mu\to\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t},\mu)$ is the continuous, finite-rank, pseudovector bundle

$$\mathfrak{V}_\mu := \{((A,\Phi),(w,s)) : (A,\Phi)\in\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t},\mu) \text{ and } (w,s)\in\operatorname{Ran}\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\}/\mathcal{G}_E,$$

where we recall that $\operatorname{Ran}\Pi_{A,\Phi,\mu}\subset L^2_{k-1}(X,\Lambda^+\otimes\mathfrak{g}_E)\oplus L^2_{k-1}(V^-)$. Here, the spaces $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\mathfrak{t},\mu)$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t},\mu)$ are defined by simply omitting the conditions in definition (9.38) involving ε and the constant C. The map $\boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu$ and section $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_\mu$ have the desired property that

$$\boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu(\boldsymbol{\varphi}_\mu^{-1}(0))\subset M(\mathfrak{t}),$$

and are smooth respect to the quotient L^2_k topology upon restriction to $\mathcal{C}^0(\mathfrak{t})$: smoothness follows by the same argument as used in the proof of smoothness in the case of the Banach-space inverse function theorem [1], where the existence of an inverse is established via a contraction-mapping argument, just as we employ here.

The gluing map, gluing-data obstruction bundle, and gluing-data obstruction section are then defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma} &= \boldsymbol{\delta}_\mu \circ \boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu,\Sigma} : \mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0) \to \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}), \\ \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mu,\Sigma} &= \boldsymbol{\varphi}_\mu \circ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mu,\Sigma} : \mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0) \to \Xi_\mu, \\ \Xi_\mu &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}^*_{\mu,\Sigma}\mathfrak{V}_\mu, \end{aligned} \tag{9.41}$$

where the precompact subset $\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell)$ is chosen according to the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1. The estimates in Proposition 5.5 for $\mathfrak{S}(A,\Phi)$, the eigenvalue estimates in Theorem 8.3 for the Laplacian $d^1_{A,\Phi}d^{1,*}_{A,\Phi}$, and the operator bounds for $P_{A,\Phi,\mu}$ in Corollary 9.3 ensure that pairs (A,Φ) in the image of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu,\Sigma}$ obey the open constraints (9.39) for a suitable choice of positive constants ε, μ and C. Hence, the image of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu,\Sigma}$, when $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu,\Sigma}$ is restricted to $\mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0)$, is contained in $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon)$ for small enough λ_0 and ε_ℓ defining the relatively open, precompact submanifold $\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t}_\ell,\mu,\varepsilon_\ell)$. □

The rank of $\mathfrak{V}_\mu$ varies over $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon)$, so that is why we only refer to it as being a 'pseudovector bundle'. However, the construction of $\mathbf{Gl}^+(\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}, \Sigma, \lambda_0)$ (via the choice of family $\mathcal{U}_{\ell,\mu}$ of background pairs (A_0,Φ_0)) in §3 and Theorem 8.3 ensure that its image under $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_{\mu,\Sigma}$ is contained in an open subset of $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{t},\mu,\varepsilon)$ over which $\mathfrak{V}_\mu$ has constant rank and is thus a vector bundle when restricted to this open subset.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, and T. Ratiu, *Manifolds, tensor analysis, and applications*, second ed., Springer, New York, 1988.

[2] R. A. Adams, *Sobolev spaces*, Academic Press, Orlando, FL, 1975.

[3] S. Agmon, A. Douglis, and L. Nirenberg, *Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. I*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **12** (1959), 623–727.

[4] ———, *Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. II*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **17** (1964), 35–92.

[5] M. F. Atiyah, V. K. Patodi, and I. M. Singer, *Spectral asymmetry in Riemannian geometry. I*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **77** (1975), 43–69.

[6] T. Aubin, *Nonlinear analysis on complex manifolds. Monge-Ampère equations*, Springer, New York, 1982.

[7] S. E. Cappell, R. Lee, and E. Y. Miller, *Self-adjoint elliptic operators and manifold decompositions. I. Low eigenmodes and stretching*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **49** (1996), 825–866.

[8] I. Chavel, *Eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry*, Academic Press, New York, 1984.

[9] S. K. Donaldson, *An application of gauge theory to four-dimensional topology*, J. Differential Geom. **18** (1983), 279–315.

[10] ———, *Connections, cohomology and the intersection forms of four manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **24** (1986), 275–341.

[11] ———, *Polynomial invariants for smooth four-manifolds*, Topology **29** (1990), 257–315.

[12] S. K. Donaldson and P. B. Kronheimer, *The geometry of four-manifolds*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 1990.

[13] S. K. Donaldson and D. P. Sullivan, *Quasi-conformal four-manifolds*, Acta Math. **163** (1990), 181–252.

[14] P. M. N. Feehan, Lecture at the conference on Geometry, Analysis and Mathematical Physics, Obernai, France, June 1999.

[15] ———, Lecture at the Four-Manifolds Workshop, Mathematische Forschungsinstitut, Oberwolfach, Germany, May 1996.

[16] ———, *Critical-exponent norms and the slice theorem for the quotient space of connections*, submitted to a print journal; dg-ga/9711004.

[17] ———, *Generic metrics, irreducible rank-one PU(2) monopoles, and transversality*, to appear in Comm. Anal. Geom., math.DG/9809001.

[18] ———, *A Kato-Yau inequality for harmonic spinors and decay estimate for eigenspinors*, submitted to a print journal; math.DG/9903021.

[19] ———, *Geometry of the ends of the moduli space of anti-self-dual connections*, J. Differential Geom. **42** (1995), 465–553.

[20] P. M. N. Feehan and T. G. Leness, *Donaldson invariants and wall-crossing formulas. I: Continuity of gluing and obstruction maps*, submitted to a print journal, math.DG/9812060.

[21] ———, *Links of degree-one reducible PU(2) monopoles*, in preparation.

[22] ———, *Non-Abelian monopoles and the relation between Donaldson and Seiberg-Witten invariants of smooth four-manifolds*, unpublished manuscript, 210 pages, February 1996.

[23] ———, *PU(2) monopoles and links of top-level Seiberg-Witten moduli spaces*, preprint (sections 1–3 of [24]).

[24] ———, *PU(2) monopoles. II: Highest-level singularities and relations between four-manifold invariants*, first version of [23] and [25], December 8, 1997, dg-ga/9712005 (v1).

[25] ———, *PU(2) monopoles. II: Top-level Seiberg-Witten moduli spaces and a special case of Witten's conjecture*, preprint (sections 4–7 of [24]).

[26] ———, *PU(2) monopoles. IV: Surjectivity of gluing maps*, in preparation.

[27] ———, *PU(2) monopoles. V: Intersection theory*, in preparation.

[28] ———, *PU(2) monopoles and relations between four-manifold invariants*, Topology Appl. **88** (1998), 111–145, dg-ga/9709022.

[29] ———, *PU(2) monopoles. I: Regularity, Uhlenbeck compactness, and transversality*, J. Differential Geom. **49** (1998), 265–410, dg-ga/9710032.

[30] R. Fintushel and R. Stern, *Immersed spheres in 4-manifolds and the immersed Thom conjecture*, Turkish J. Math. **19** (1995), 145–157.

[31] ———, *Blow-up formulas for Donaldson invariants*, Ann. of Math. **143** (1996), 529–546, alg-geom/9405002.

[32] G. B. Folland, *Introduction to partial differential equations*, second ed., Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995.

[33] D. Freed and K. K. Uhlenbeck, *Instantons and four-manifolds*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 1991.

[34] R. Friedman and J. W. Morgan, *Smooth four-manifolds and complex surfaces*, Springer, Berlin, 1994.

[35] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, second ed., Springer, New York, 1983.

[36] P. B. Gilkey, *Invariance theory, the heat equation, and the Atiyah-Singer index theorem*, second ed., Publish or Perish, Wilmington, DE, 1984.

[37] L. Göttsche, *Modular forms and Donaldson invariants for 4-manifolds with* $b^+ = 1$, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), 827–843, alg-geom/9506018.

[38] D. Groisser and T. H. Parker, *Sharp decay estimates for Yang-Mills fields*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **5** (1997), 439–474.

[39] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators*, vol. I-IV, Springer, New York, 1983.

[40] S. Kobayashi, *Differential geometry of complex vector bundles*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1987.

[41] D. Kotschick, *SO(3) invariants for four-manifolds with* $b^+ = 1$, Proc. London Math. Soc. **63** (1991), 426–448.

[42] D. Kotschick and J. W. Morgan, *SO(3) invariants for four-manifolds with* $b^+ = 1$*, II*, J. Differential Geom. **39** (1994), 433–456.

[43] P. B. Kronheimer and T. S. Mrowka, *The structure of Donaldson's invariants for four-manifolds not of simple type*, unpublished manuscript, April 1994, http://www.math.harvard.edu.

[44] ______, *Embedded surfaces and the structure of Donaldson's polynomial invariants*, J. Differential Geom. **43** (1995), 573–734.

[45] H. B. Lawson and M-L. Michelsohn, *Spin geometry*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988.

[46] G. Moore and E. Witten, *Integration over the u-plane in Donaldson theory*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **1** (1997), 298–387, hep-th/9709193.

[47] J. W. Morgan and T. S. Mrowka, *A note on Donaldson's polynomial invariants*, Internat. Math. Res. Notes **10** (1992), 223–230.

[48] J. W. Morgan, Z. Szabó, and C. H. Taubes, *A product formula for the Seiberg-Witten invariants and the generalized Thom conjecture*, J. Differential Geom. **44** (1996), 706–788.

[49] C. B. Morrey, *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1966, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 130.

[50] T. S. Mrowka, *Marston Morse memorial lectures*, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ, April, 1999.

[51] ______, *Local Mayer-Vietoris principle for Yang-Mills moduli spaces*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 1988.

[52] C. Okonek and A. Teleman, *Quaternionic monopoles*, Comm. Math. Phys. **180** (1996), 363–388, alg-geom/9505029.

[53] V. Y. Pidstrigatch, Lectures at the Newton Institute in December 1994, Oberwolfach in May 1996, and the Newton Institute in November 1996.

[54] V. Y. Pidstrigatch and A. N. Tyurin, *Localisation of Donaldson invariants along the Seiberg-Witten classes*, dg-ga/9507004.

[55] J. Råde, *Decay estimates for Yang-Mills fields: Two simplified proofs*, Global analysis in modern mathematics (Orono, ME, 1991; Waltham, MA 1992), Publish or Perish, Houston, TX, 1993, pp. 91–105.

[56] D. Salamon, *Spin geometry and Seiberg-Witten invariants*, Birkhäuser, Boston, to appear.

[57] E. Stein, *Singular integral operators and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970.

[58] C. H. Taubes, *Self-dual Yang-Mills connections on non-self-dual 4-manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **17** (1982), 139–170.

[59] ______, *Path-connected Yang-Mills moduli spaces*, J. Differential Geometry **19** (1984), 337–392.

[60] ______, *Self-dual connections on 4-manifolds with indefinite intersection matrix*, J. Differential Geom. **19** (1984), 517–560.

[61] ______, *A framework for Morse theory for the Yang-Mills functional*, Invent. Math. **94** (1988), 327–402.

[62] ______, *The stable topology of self-dual moduli spaces*, J. Differential Geom. **29** (1989), 162–230.

[63] ______, *The existence of anti-self-dual conformal structures*, J. Differential Geometry **36** (1992), 163–253.

[64] A. Teleman, *Moduli spaces of PU(2) monopoles*, dg-ga/9702006.

[65] ______, *Moduli spaces of PU(2) monopoles*, Asian J. Math., to appear, (revised version of [64]), math.DG/9906163.

[66] ______, *Non-Abelian Seiberg-Witten theory and stable oriented pairs*, Internat. J. Math. **8** (1997), 507–535, alg-geom/9609020.

[67] K. K. Uhlenbeck, *Connections with L^p bounds on curvature*, Comm. Math. Phys. **83** (1982), 31–42.

[68] ______, *Removable singularities in Yang-Mills fields*, Comm. Math. Phys. **83** (1982), 11–29.

[69] ______, *The Chern classes of Sobolev connections*, Comm. Math. Phys. **101** (1985), 449–457.

[70] E. Witten, Lecture at the Newton Institute, Cambridge, UK, December, 1994.

[71] ______, *Monopoles and four-manifolds*, Math. Res. Lett. **1** (1994), 769–796, hep-th/9411102.

Department of Mathematics, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210
E-mail address: `feehan@math.ohio-state.edu; http://www.math.ohio-state.edu/~feehan`
Current address: School of Mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, Olden Lane, Princeton, NJ 08540
E-mail address: `feehan@math.ias.edu; http://www.math.ias.edu/~feehan`

Department of Mathematics, Florida International University, Miami, FL 33199
E-mail address: `lenesst@fiu.edu`